

AMERICA

A·CATHOLIC·REVIEW·OF·THE·WEEK

VOL. XXII. No. 12 }
WHOLE No. 538 }

January 10, 1920

{ \$4.00 A YEAR
PRICE, 10 CENTS }

Chronicle

Peace Treaty.—Secretary Lansing was officially informed by the American Embassy in Tokio, on January 2, that Japan's ratification of the Versailles Treaty was formally sent to the Secretariat in Paris on December 28 by M. Keishiro Matsui, Japanese Ambassador to France. Four of the five principal Allied and Associated Powers have now formally notified the Secretariat at Paris of their ratification.

Japan Deposits Ratification

On December 31 it was stated officially in Paris that the protocol to the Versailles Treaty in all probability would be signed by Germany without delay, and that the Treaty itself would become effective not later than January 6. Germany's change of attitude was occasioned by the fact that the Allies signified their readiness to reduce the demands for 400,000 tonnage in reparation for the sinking of the German warships at the Scapa Flow, if it could be shown that the Allied estimate of German tonnage had been overestimated. The arrangement was that 242,000 tons of material were to be handed over and as much more as might seem just when accurate estimates of the amount of tonnage possessed by Germany were at hand. Baron von Lersner assured the Allies that Germany would agree to the new proposal. Another difficulty, however, has arisen over the plebiscites to be held, according to the Peace Treaty, in Upper Silesia, Allenstein, Memel and other territories. Herr von Simson, who is the head of the German plebiscite delegation, informed the Supreme Council, on December 31, that Germany held a different interpretation of the plebiscite arrangements from that held by the Allies, and that he had no power to act without referring the dispute to the German National Assembly. The Allies formulated their demands in a new Note, to which Germany has not yet replied. The date set for the Treaty to go into effect has, therefore, been again indefinitely postponed.

The failure of the United States to accept a mandate over Turkey has resulted in the revival of the whole question of Turkey's status in Europe. The Greeks are proposing that the task of guarding Constantinople be handed over to them. Italy is said to be not unwilling to assume the mandate, and both Great Britain and France are possibilities. But it is no longer the unanimous opinion of the Allies that Constantinople should

The Turkish Question

be internationalized, and there is, too, considerable disagreement as to the manner of the internationalization. Lloyd George recently declared that the Turk should be obliged to leave the city, but France believes that the Turk should stay, because otherwise her prestige in the East will be diminished and perhaps trouble occasioned among her Mohammedan subjects.

Switzerland, Norway, Spain and Holland have all proposed reservations to the Treaty. The answer of the Supreme Council to the Swiss Government, namely: that the questions of reservations must be decided by the League of Nations, is taken generally to mean that the Allied Powers do not wish to reach any final decision until the attitude of the United States is definitely settled.

The Neutral Nations

The American Ambassador to France, on January 3, officially notified the Supreme Council that President Wilson had agreed to issue the formal call for the first meeting of the Council of the League of Nations. It is understood that M. Clemenceau will issue an informal invitation to the delegates to meet in Paris, and that after their arrival Mr. Wilson will convene the first meeting. This action of the President, in the event of the United States deciding not to join the League, will take on the character of an act of international courtesy.

Call of League Council

France.—As the mist clears away from the national elections in France, two principal results stand out with clearness: the elections were a victory for the elements of law and order as opposed to those of Bolshevism and anarchy; they were also a victory for the Catholics.

Parliamentary Prospects

The *union sacrée*, which made the triumph over Germany a possibility and a fact, persisted in spite of the efforts of those who endeavored to resurrect class, religious and political divisions. The true friends of France, as *Les Nouvelles Religieuses* remarks, joined hands and hearts, set themselves to forget the ancient quarrels and gave mutual promises not to revive them. As a consequence the united Socialists won only 56 seats in the Chamber of Deputies as compared with the 104 they held in the former parliament; the Radicals and Socialist Radicals have only 129 seats as compared with 257 in the old Chamber; the number of deputies, either pronouncedly Catholic or favorable to Catholic interests, is more than 200 whereas less than 100 deputies were to

be found in the preceding legislature who were willing to include Catholics in the program of liberty, fraternity and equality. M. de la Brière, writing in the *Etudes* for December 5-20, points out that the French press has insisted on the fact that the elections were a victory over Bolshevism and a vindication of the Ministry of Clemenceau, but has been guilty of deliberate dissimulation as to the still more significant result, which is the victory gained by the more conservative elements of the country over the radical and anticlerical elements. The fact is that the conservative portion of France has been successful to a degree unparalleled since 1871. The elections were not an approval on the recent ministry, for three of the members of that ministry, and one sub-minister failed of reelection. The movement is undoubtedly away from radicalism and towards "public order, sane liberty, social peace and French fraternity."

The prospects for religious peace are brighter than they have been for years. Many of the determined enemies of the Church have been eliminated from the Chamber and have been replaced by Catholics of high position and distinguished abilities and by young men of independent views; so that Catholic views will have active, energetic representation. During the electoral campaign all parties held out the olive branch. M. Clemenceau and M. Millerand, for instance, made France ring with declarations in favor of national concord; and the practically universal practice of the candidates of the *union sacrée*, Progressives, Republicans of the Left, Democrats, Radicals, Liberals and Conservatives, was to inscribe on their programs, the resumption of diplomatic relations with the Vatican, liberty of associations, liberty of education, and religious peace. It was with this understanding that the deputies were elected. *Les Nouvelles Religieuses* is confident that these "public, solemn, unanimous promises" will be kept. During the weeks preceding November 16, M. Clemenceau, M. Millerand, M. Aristide Briand, M. Paul Deschanel, M. Louis Barthou, M. René Viviani and others, hitherto more or less identified with anticlerical animus, gave it to be understood, according to the *Etudes*,

that the *Lois laïques* of the actual régime were not, of course, to be changed; nevertheless it would not be forbidden to give them, in the new circumstances, a new interpretation, tending to effect a reconciliation of the lay character of the republican State with respect for just confessional liberties.

M. de la Brière remarks that it would be rather naïve not to recognize the equivocal, and perhaps fallacious, character of these declarations, but he sees in them the manifest purpose of preparing the way for the readjustment which political opportunism will require of these masters of power. The anticlericals, it would appear are reading the signs of the times.

The *Etudes* makes no secret of the fact that the Catholic deputies belong to different parties, but it sees in this divergence of political views no bar to their united action in defense of religious liberties. Just as there is

no reason why they should not unite on agricultural, marine and industrial questions, so there is no difficulty about their forming a coalition, under the direction of M. Groussau, in order to secure reparation for the legislative iniquities which have pressed hard on Catholic consciences for the past forty years. The principal matters on which there should be a revision of religious politics in France, are, according to M. de la Brière:

(1) The re-establishment of diplomatic relations between the Government of France and the Papacy. (2) A régime of religious worship which shall assure to each religious belief, according to the rules of its own organization, the right to exist and to enjoy recognized legal possession of property. (3) A régime of education which shall procure everywhere for families that have religious beliefs, free religious schools, from which no class of teachers shall be excluded for religious motives, and which shall have a share in public appropriations in proportion to the number of their pupils. (4) A régime of associations, which shall guarantee to religious bodies the same freedom as that enjoyed by non-religious bodies to acquire a legal status and corporate revenues.

Serious thinkers in France see in the November elections the dawn of deliverance from anticlerical persecution, and an indication that the country is determined to have no return to the domestic strife which embittered and obstructed the national life before the war.

Ireland.—For two days American papers made much of another alleged riot supposed to have taken place in Phoenix Park, Dublin. In some instances there was a more or less clumsy insinuation that an attack on the viceregal lodge had been happily frustrated. The inquest

The Disorders held to determine the cause of the death of the two victims of the affair brought out the interesting information that a deaf, intoxicated, unarmed man who was peacefully making his way through the park was challenged by a sentry. No answer received, the sentry and three guards set upon the wayfarer, and in the melee the latter and one soldier were killed "by the military," that is the soldier was killed by his companions. In announcing the decision, the foreman of the jury declared: "We consider that the military acted in a most heartless manner." So much for another atrocity colored for American eyes. The report about the attack on Lord French, having served the purpose of British propaganda, is scarcely ever mentioned now. Sinn Fein has disavowed any connection with the alleged attempt on the Lord Lieutenant's life. A cable from London declares that the assault was of government make, and points to these strange items in the British statements: Armed guards in motors or on horseback pursued thirty assailants, and no one was captured. Two grenades burst and, yet, no one was injured by them. The *Irish Press*, under date of December 27, examines the various dispatches sent to American papers, and after showing forth their inconsistencies and fatuity says:

To understand how a simple accident such as the bursting of a tire or misfire of the engine of one of the cars would cause such a sensation, one must understand the tension that exists in

Ireland. This is indicated by Lord French himself, when he says he is "governing Ireland, pistol in hand." Policeman Loughlin was evidently near the scene talking to a civilian. It is not unlikely that a burst tire or something of the kind caused Policeman Loughlin to fire his revolver or his hand grenades, and it is likely poor Savage is the civilian who was talking to Policeman Loughlin, and as he was probably the only civilian around, he was the only one who was killed. It is also probable that when shooting started, the soldiers and policemen fired at everything in sight and, according to instructions, threw their hand grenades into the hedges. Having discovered their mistake, with one man, a civilian, killed, it was necessary to make the whole thing look genuine. This would account for the empty automobile being shattered by a bomb and the five or six or twenty assailants escaping across the fields in safety from the military escort which galloped quickly to the scene.

Meantime arrests and deportations to England continue as usual. *Old Ireland*, under date of December 20, declares that Wormwood Scrubbs has made ready for 500 prisoners, and further states that deportations will continue as long as Ireland buys and sells and produces according to her own desire, thus putting England on the same basis as other nations. The London *Morning Post*, reflecting government opinion, advocates the permanent incarceration of Sinn Feiners, and pretends to fear the ridicule that would follow the stoppage of deportations.

Italy.—Early in the week, Premier Nitti and Foreign Minister Scialoja assured the Senate that nothing had been compromised concerning the Adriatic settlement.

A Ministerial Statement

They declared that they would return to Paris with the hope of a satisfactory solution of the Fiume question, as both Great Britain and France had agreed to some changes in Italy's favor, in modification of the last proposals of President Wilson put forward after the rejection of the propositions made by Foreign Minister Tittoni. The charge brought against Italy, Signor Scialoja declared, was that she had demanded Dalmatia and Fiume, although, according to the terms of the Pact of London, Fiume had been awarded to Croatia. The Italian Foreign Minister asserted that there was no contradiction in this, as Italy has a treaty with France and Great Britain, which unfortunately is not recognized by the United States, granting her Dalmatia. Italy, he continued, asked for the fulfilment of that treaty, but did not ask for Fiume; it was Fiume which asked to be annexed to Italy. He added that according to the principles of nationality and self-determination, the Italian people could not help supporting the claims of Fiume, which had the right to decide its own fate.

Signor Scialoja declared that the object of Italy was twofold, the protection of the Italian nationality of Fiume and Dalmatia, and the defense of the Adriatic. He informed the Senate that the American Secretary of State, Mr. Lansing, had proposed the neutralization of the Dalmatian Islands and the surrounding seas, as far as Ragusa, but affirmed that such a plan would leave a part of the Italian coast exposed to enemy attacks in time of war, and that while Italy had no intention of attacking

the enemy, it needed some guarantee as to its future safety.

Premier Nitti declared that the statements of Signor Scialoja represented the views of the entire Cabinet. He denied that the relations of the country with the Allies were not cordial. Referring to certain statements on Italian policy made by the French Prime Minister, M. Clemenceau, he admitted that while they justified a certain apprehension, they should not be unduly exaggerated. However, the Prime Minister pointed out one or two historical inaccuracies in M. Clemenceau's words. Italy, he continued, did not pledge herself to give Fiume to Croatia, for the latter was not a contracting party. It was true, he admitted, that Fiume was not included in the Pact of London, but it was also true that if the Pact of London were executed, Dalmatia would immediately be given to Italy.

The Premier expressed the hope that Serbia would remember the assistance she had received from Italy, and that Yugoslavia might understand that Italy's desire was not for foreign domination. He disclaimed above everything else any intention on the part of Italy of engaging in new wars, but added that as long as some of the Allied Powers made the Yugoslav minority believe that it would be supported in its intentions, it would be impossible to expect moderation in that party. "We desire," he continued, "that the situation in the Adriatic cease to be that of mere occupation of what we want. We wish it to become a vindication of the right to occupy only what is acknowledged by the Powers to be our right." He asserted, moreover, that the question of Fiume, Dalmatia and Albania was closely connected with the internal situation in Italy and Italy's credit abroad. Since last September, he said, Italy had been unable to obtain any loans, either in Allied or neutral countries, because these countries feared that, even if war were not actually waged in Italy or by Italian arms abroad, there would be such a situation in the country as to cause the gravest consequences.

Mexico.—Part VI of the Fall findings are quite as interesting as any that have so far come from the press. The chief points of interest are as follows: A restatement

Fall Findings Part VI

of Carranza's perfidy (pp. 769, 770); an account of the recall of Henry Lane Wilson, who was removed from office because he insisted on American rights and resented our Government's improper lack of confidence in him. Scurrilous rumors about Minister Wilson were spread by Carranza propagandists and representatives of our Government which went so far as to throw open the confidential files of the State Department to a newspaper man in order that garbled reports about Minister Wilson might be sent broadcast (pp. 773, 774). Lind informed Huerta that President Wilson would not allow him to become President of Mexico, and at the Niagara conference the Mexican delegates were informed that Carranza only could occupy that office. Beaten at this, Lind was

ordered to compromise with Huerta. This was scorned by Huerta and Lind remained in Vera Cruz several months conspiring with revolutionists to overthrow the Mexican Government. He actually entered into negotiations with a colonel in Huerta's army to overthrow the President and lead Zapata into Mexico City (pp. 775, 776). American citizens, resident in Mexico City, sent a committee of seven Americans to Washington to explain the situation. This committee was granted an audience of ten minutes by Bryan, who spoke to them for eight minutes. They saw President Wilson, who listened to the spokesman with a far-off expression in his eyes (p. 777). Later, a delegation from El Paso went to Bryan to intercede for American men, women and children stranded in Chihuahua. The then Secretary of State insulted them by declaring they were not concerned with American women and children, but with their own property (p. 777). A congressman from Texas was even more grossly insulted by the President (pp. 777, 780). The Tampico incident and the ridiculous occupation of Vera Cruz are fully explained. In this case Admiral Fletcher's advice was set aside for Lind's, with the result that twenty American bluejackets and marines were killed (p. 781). False statements in regard to facts that occurred at Tampico are attributed to Admiral Mayo, and he is accused of having deserted his post of duty (p. 782 to 787). Huerta signified to the Niagara conference his intention to resign. Carranza refused to send delegates to the conference and refused also to suspend hostilities. The Mexicans then asked that Carranza's claims be ignored. This was refused by the Americans and finally the conference broke up, because the "American Government could not agree to anything until it had consulted the Carranza revolutionary junta" (p. 791). About this time the American Government put an embargo on arms and ammunition. Mr. Bryan deliberately allowed the embargo to be broken and later was party to a cheap subterfuge by which Carranza got a plentiful supply of munitions of war (p. 793). The character of the Carranza revolution is graphically described, including the treatment of the priests of Mexico City (pp. 795, 796, 797). Mr. Lind's statements about Carranza's restraint are flatly contradicted once again and a black picture of loot and murder is drawn. Obregon, now a candidate for the presidency, is shown to have been the most savage of all the leaders (pp. 798, 799, 800, 801). After this there appear on the pages of Part VI amusing notes from our Government to Carranza, with Carranza's sly answers. Then the almost omnipresent Mr. Lind appears, and this is the testimony, given under oath:

In private conversation Mr. Lind attributed all the ills of Mexico to the influence of the Catholic Church, and argued that this institution in Mexico must be destroyed. In a conversation with Mr. O'Shaughnessy, on a remark of the latter that he had just received a report to the effect that several Catholic priests had been killed, Mr. Lind stated that this was good news, that the more Catholic priests they killed in Mexico the better it would suit him, and the more pleased the President would be.

In Washington, in a conversation that took place during the Pan-American conference, when it was reported that the United States would not recognize Carranza, Mr. Lind exclaimed to the chairman of the International committee of Mexico City, "My God, poor Mexico will fall back into the clutches of the Catholic Church!"

Respects are also paid to these other agents of Mr. Wilson, the Rev. John R. Silliman, missionary and milk vender, who always referred to the Carranza cause as our cause and to Carranzistas as we (p. 813); the Rev. William Bayard Hale, who is accused of selling his services to Germany (p. 814), and the Rev. Henry Tupper, who received a check of some \$4,000 from Carranza and offered to mention a Mexican favorably in a magazine article, for a good, round sum of money (p. 814). So the sordid story runs, a record of shameful intrigue and disgusting dishonesty on the part of our officials, and of intrigue and crass brutality on the part of Mexicans. Part VI, and the other parts also, of the Fall findings should be in the hands of every reader of AMERICA. Catholic readers will learn from them once again what this Administration did for the Church in Mexico.

Russia.—During the past month the Bolshevik forces have been winning important successes on the three main fronts. In Eastern Siberia they followed up their capture of Omsk by a steady forward drive which eventually placed Irkutsk, occupied by Kolchak forces, in a state of siege. In less than two months the Bolsheviks advanced almost 700 miles. Late in December Admiral Kolchak relinquished the command of the anti-Bolshevik forces in Siberia and appointed General Semenov Commander-in-Chief of the troops east of Lake Baikal, and also set up a committee government in Irkutsk. Anarchy is said to prevail in the neighborhood of that city and throughout the three Far Eastern provinces of Siberia. General Semenov recruited the soldiers who deserted Kolchak, whose power is now quite gone.

On the southwestern front the Bolshevik forces have also been successful. They took Kharkov in Southern Russia, one of General Denikin's important bases, and on January 1 he was reported to be retreating on his entire line. Two days later a dispatch from Moscow stated that General Denikin's government in Southern Russia had been overthrown and that General Romavovsky had been chosen anti-Bolshevik chief. In addition to these other successes, the Bolsheviks have put to rout the Northwest army which under General Yudinitch was menacing Petrograd.

On Christmas Day Premier Kei Hara gave an interview to the press and announced that Japan would oppose the spread of Bolshevism in Siberia, but denied that she meant to seize any territory in that country. "The minute the Red menace is settled," he said, "she will withdraw every soldier." The Premier said that there is no truth in the report that Japan is negotiating a secret treaty with Russia and Germany.

The Anglican Bishops and the Pope

J. D. TIBBITS

THE recent visit of certain Anglican bishops to the Vatican has proved, in one sense if in no other, a success of no small importance. It has placed upon record, more strikingly perhaps than any other event could, a vital misconception of the very principles upon which Catholicism is founded, so very vital as to make one wonder whether the distinguished gentlemen may not have similarly misconceived the principles of their own faith. Catholics are not unaccustomed to these things. It would be strange at this late day if they were, for if the history of Protestantism is a history of changing conceptions, it is no less a history of changing misconceptions. And if it is true, as is undoubtedly the case, that the Church is misconceived today in a manner totally different from that of a generation ago, it is all the more important that Catholics should have a clear understanding of it. To see ourselves as others see us is almost as necessary as to see ourselves as we are.

In making explicit, therefore, what might have remained indefinitely obscure, the Anglican bishops have rendered a distinct service, and a service which all the commentators upon the incident in question, have both amplified and confirmed. It is rarely that we find unanimity in Protestantism. And it is highly significant that when we do find it, it should be centered upon so singular an error. But it is even more remarkable that an error of this magnitude should have occurred amidst just the conditions that it did. We are all accustomed to read much of the light of the twentieth century. In Protestant literature it is usually the religious light of which we read, and it is always held up to us in vivid contrast with the supposed darkness of every other century. Then too, this is an age of criticism, and criticism is, of course, a distinctly twentieth-century product. When then, in this age of criticism and light, we encounter the curious spectacle of a body of professed and professional experts utterly misunderstanding a fact which not only comes eminently within their own province, but is, perhaps, one of the most obvious of all the facts with which they have to deal, there is an inescapable conviction that something is wrong. And the question is bound to suggest itself, as to whether this something is wrong with the age, or wrong with the experts.

The misconception of which I speak is, in a sense, a natural one for Protestants to make, but it is natural only for those Protestants who are given to superficial thought. And so when bishops and theological commentators display such remarkable powers of misunderstanding, one cannot but wonder, as I said before, as to just how deeply they have gone into the principles which are fundamental to Christianity itself.

I speak of principles, but, as a matter of fact, there is but one principle upon which all Protestantism revolves, just as there may be said to be one principle upon which Catholicism revolves. To understand clearly, therefore, these principles, is to understand, at least implicitly, the religions which they underly. To misconceive them is to misconceive all that has been developed from and by them. And it is just because they have been misconceived in such a very vital sense that it may be an advantage to restate them, if for no other reason than to correct an error which has become far too common to be passed unnoticed.

If we but grant the simple, yet fundamental fact, that some 2000 years ago a revelation was given which possessed a distinct personal significance not only to every man then living, but to every man who would subsequently live, we are forced to the conviction that in some way or other it must be both knowable and known. This conviction is almost too self-evident to require demonstration; for unless it can be known, it is doomed to be forever ineffective, and a revelation which lacks all provision for its effectiveness is, in a rational sense, unthinkable. Then too, it requires an almost indefinite application, which is, of course, little less than an almost indefinite development; for each succeeding age brings with it many problems quite peculiar to itself, but which bear an inevitable and invariable relation to religion. This will, therefore, as time goes on, undergo a process of gradual explication. Were this not true, its significance for modern men would forthwith evaporate, and whatever value it retained would be only in a partial and chiefly in an historical sense. For a vitalizing force must be no less competent to solve the moral problems of the United States in the twentieth century, than it was to solve the problems of imperial Rome in the first.

Now there are just two principles by which the subject-matter of this original revelation may be made to bridge the chasm of 2000 years and to present its facts to ourselves and their application to our problems. One of these principles is that of authority; the other is perhaps best summed up in the word impressionism. Beyond these two there is no alternative known to reason: and between their respective claims the entire system of Catholicism and Protestantism must be judged. Both are, in a sense, methods of apprehending facts, but we must bear in mind that the facts which they aim to apprehend are in a class quite by themselves; and that if they are at all times of the utmost importance, they are not infrequently of the utmost obscurity. Their importance is a logical corollary from the fact of revelation; while their obscurity is abundantly evident from the

almost infinite diversity of viewpoints by which men regard them. If then, we are to have definite knowledge of the original facts, one or the other of these two methods must be invoked. Either there must be a living authority which is both accessible and competent to tell us that which we are morally bound to know, or we must guess it, amidst such light as history and criticism may afford.

The first of these methods is distinctly and essentially that of the Catholic Church. No one can gainsay its directness, its efficiency, or its eminent rationality. One argument only is urged against it, though it is urged with great variety of form and oftentimes with great plausibility of expression; and that is, that it fetters the mind and obstructs speculation. This is a charge which it is very difficult for Catholics to understand, despite the fact that it is, in great measure, true; for it is true in the precise sense in which every known fact is a fettering of the mind, and that as we widen the sphere of positive knowledge, the sphere of speculation must correspondingly contract. The critics, however, of the principle of authority, appear to forget the special significance of the subject-matter with which it deals and the field wherein it rules; they forget that the very purpose of speculation is to afford that which authority has already insured; and in their charge of intellectual narrowness they forget that the narrowest of all things is the truth.

Now it is quite impossible to deny that the truth may likewise be reached by that other system which I have called impressionism and which I have said is little else than guesswork, for no one, surely, can logically assume that guesswork must inevitably result in error. But a difficulty arises which appears of far more importance to Catholics than it does to our Protestant friends; and this difficulty lies in the absolute as well as the permanent uncertainty as to whether our guesses be objectively right or wrong. It is true that impressionism, as the very name I have given to the system implies, does offer a sort of sanction to the convictions of its adherents, for the guesswork of which I speak is no affair of mere random results, like those obtained by the tossing of a coin. Whenever there is, among Protestants, a question of the truth or falsity of a religious doctrine, the distinction is made to rest wholly upon a favorable or unfavorable report of the feelings. They become, therefore, at once, the cause, the confirmation, and the sanction of the guesswork.

But the really perplexing part of this system, to Catholics, is to know just what relation these feelings, whose interest lies only in affectations, and which clearly have no capacity to report facts, bears to objective truth. They see Dr. Abbott, for example, insisting upon a real absence of Christ in the Eucharist, and Bishop Weller insisting upon a real presence. Yet though the one views the subject with the vision of the New Theology, and the other with all deference to antiquity and tradition, they are both impressionists in an equal sense, for neither

has an authority other than himself which can say to him the last word, or pronounce the final and decisive judgment. It is true that the bishop may appeal to the Scriptures and to the early Church. Dr. Abbott will quote the very Scriptures against him; and if he finds the voice of the early Church too unmistakable to be denied he can at least accuse it of the same misinterpretation as that of which he accuses Dr. Weller. He is indeed more direct and more frank in his impressionism: but he is not one bit more an impressionist.

Now Catholics are quite willing to admit that the truth may come through impressionism. They freely concede that, in the illustration above given, it may have come in all its fulness to Bishop Weller. What they do not understand and never can understand, is how he or any other impressionist can know when they have it.

It is far from my purpose to criticize this theory of religion, but it is one which both Catholics and Protestants, and Protestants in particular, ought thoroughly to understand. There are many indications that they do not, the chief of which is, that it is seldom, if ever, explicitly defended in their writings. There are indeed, some indications that the laity vaguely comprehend it, for no one who comes in direct contact with modern unbelief can be oblivious to the general consciousness that all theology is a matter of guesswork, and theologians a body of professional guessers. This, however, is the result of inferences rather than of admissions. The clergy for the most part seem altogether unconscious of it.

But curious as this may be, it is even more curious that they should be so ready to impute to us the very principle of which they are so unconscious in themselves. Yet if the visit of the Anglican bishops to the Vatican meant anything at all, there was nothing else which it could possibly mean: for had they not been firm in their conviction that the Pope was an impressionist, that visit would never have been made. The learned gentlemen who subsequently wrote comments upon the incident proved this; and they proved, too, that their view was practically coexistent with all Protestantism. The Pope was reactionary, obstinate, possessed, as one critic said, of "unconquerable pride." But had they not regarded him as an impressionist they would have had no motive in inviting his cooperation with a conference which was designed to be little else than a symposium of impressions.

And it is not wholly insignificant, that while the bishops failed utterly to comprehend the principles of the Pope, the Pope was perfectly clear as to the principles of the bishops. In his few reported words there was no trace whatever of misunderstanding. There was, on the contrary, a broad and correct conception of both opposing viewpoints. And of all the company the Pope was apparently the only one who had heeded the precept of the late Lord Acton: that whatever is rejected, should be first mastered.

The Report of the Reconstruction Commission

J. W. DAWSON

WHEN Governor Smith of New York took up the reins of the State government, after fifteen years of service in the State legislature, he appointed a Reconstruction Commission, of which Abram I. Elkus was chairman, to examine closely into the workings of our State government and to report to him regarding those matters which the Commission thought might well be changed for the proper administration of affairs.

In 1919, the legislature voted to spend about \$100,000,000 to conduct those things which it deemed necessary for the welfare of the people; and this in the face of an income of only \$50,000,000. It was clear that this condition was most serious and the first matter to which the new Commission was to give its attention was the reorganization of the State departments so that there might be some measure of retrenchment. Their report consisting of 419 pages has just been issued and is a sad commentary upon the efficiency of a democratic form of government.

Due to the tremendous growth of Federal power, our States have long ceased to be anything but a theoretical division. Since the Civil War the Federal Government has encroached more and more upon the functioning of the States. Today there remains practically only one or two fields of operation which have not wholly come under the control of the Government at Washington. Even education, which has always been a local matter, will soon come under the same domination if the Smith-Towner bill passes. The railroads, the telegraph, commerce, health, food, morals, labor, all these once regulated by State boards, are now supervised by Federal agencies. In fact there is nothing that can be classed as thoroughly local, and this especially since our experiences in the recent war, which taught, above everything else, the lesson of centralization and governmental control. Yet, despite this fact that the States are now merely theoretical geographical patches the administration of State affairs is conducted in a most extravagant and inefficient manner. This is due to a lack of any plan in government. Legislatures have enacted laws creating new departments to meet current emergencies with no eye whatever for the larger scheme of government. Places had to be found for political dependents. A new salaried commission consisting of from three to five members, always with a retinue of stenographers, clerks and other workers was the easiest way to take care of them, at the State's expense. Only the slightest excuse was necessary to bring these safe berths into being and once made who had the courage to abolish them? The result has been that there is now a senseless overlapping of authority and a ridiculous waste of the people's money by the function-

ing of many bodies doing the same work. For example, there are five departments and numerous independent boards having authority over the custody of the State parks, reserves and places of interest; there are more than seven departments assessing and collecting taxes; more than ten departments of an engineering character; numerous separate and distinctive controlling departments, boards and commissioners for health, and charitable institutions; the legal functions are scattered through ten departments besides that of the Attorney General and there are numerous administrations of educational institutions. There are more than 180 different phases of our State government, with no correlation of policy or action.

Although the Governor, through the Constitution, is the nominal head of the government, these boards act independently of him. Their heads are in no way responsible to him for appointment and their terms overlap. In place of a well-organized, centralized government controlled by a person responsible directly to the people we have a costly inefficient grouping of unrelated bodies functioning confusedly at best or not at all.

Although the State spends over \$90,000,000 a year, there is no attempt made to prepare a budget. In the last few months of the year all the department heads send in estimates of what they consider is the amount necessary for them to conduct their departments properly during the coming year. These figures represent what each head would like to obtain and are not by any means what each head should get. These requests are collated and sent to the Finance Committee of the Senate and the Ways and Means Committee of the Assembly. After a very perfunctory examination the estimates are placed upon the desk of each legislator. The volume is larger than the old-fashioned family Bible and nobody reads it. When the appropriation bill comes up for consideration the leader of the majority party tries to justify the large totals and the leader of the minority speaks in terms of horror of its extravagance. Everybody else either goes out of the chamber or falls asleep. The roll is called. In the Assembly it runs something like this: "Adler, Donohue, Machold, Witter, Ayes 130, Noes, none" and \$90,000,000 is separated from the people.

But that is not all. If any legislator feels that his district might be benefited by some public improvement, he introduces, and if powerful enough, has passed some little measure or other building a bridge in this county for \$20,000, or a new road in this county for \$50,000 or a new high school in this one for \$200,000. These sums are added to that vast amount voted upon when the "budget" was passed. Nobody makes any pretense at practising economy and when the total is published, the

political party in the minority always points an accusing finger at the party in power and speaks of "extravagance", only to be just as extravagant in its turn.

How long this will continue before we are plunged into bankruptcy is a question. But this fact is becoming more and more evident: The people in a democracy are most careless and uninterested in the workings of their government. I am sure that the reader cannot tell me off-hand who his senator and assemblyman are. But with the coming of the new State income tax adding another burden to the heavy load the average citizen now carries, there is going to come a new interest in the way our public officials spend the people's money. There is going to be a demand for an adequate return for State expenditures. When this does come then and only then shall we have efficiency in government. This tendency is now apparent. It needs fostering and development. Take the average business man. He pays a Federal income tax. If he lives in New York City he pays a personal tax. His corporation pays a State tax; if he transfers stock he pays a tax; if he owns real estate he pays a tax on it; if he lives out of the city he pays a school tax and when he dies his estate pays a tax. The limit has been reached. More money cannot come from this source. He, as a citizen, must and eventually will see to it that what he gives up in taxes is not wasted.

The Reconstruction Commission has taken up this very serious situation in a sensible way and, in its report, advocates radical changes in the State government. It would have the Governor elected for four years and would give him actual control over the administration of all State duties. It recommends that the government be organized into fifteen departments with the heads of each appointed by the Governor with the consent and advice of the Senate. This would do away with the useless election of a State Treasurer, the Attorney General, and the Comptroller and make them appointees of the Governor. The report then goes into a more detailed construction of the existing duties and arranges them into component parts. The plan that it presents, comprehensive as it is, is so simple as to suggest wonder that it had not been attempted long before this. Some of the changes are purely administrative and in no way have to do with the policies of the State itself, most of them may be brought about by enactment of the legislature.

After considerable experience in public office I do not believe that the people are interested enough in their government to care whether their public affairs are taken care of efficiently or not. In all State matters, one can see the application of the old principle that "What belongs to everybody, belongs to nobody." However, the burden of government added to the other costs of life has grown so great as to become almost unbearable and the time has come when drastic action must be taken to eliminate the unnecessary evils that exist. For this reason, the report of the Reconstruction Commission, which is a non-partisan body, should receive the widest

publicity. Public sentiment should be roused so that the recommendations that they make may be put in force.

This report of the Reconstruction Commission deals merely with the mechanics of government. Later reports will deal with State policies. It is most essential for right-minded citizens, irrespective of party affiliations, to watch these reports so that they may use their influence both as individuals and as members of organizations to aid in the enactment of the changes which are worth while and prevent the passage of laws that might prove harmful to good government. It has been our custom to sit back until we were hurt and then to cry out in pain. We should be leaders in these movements that are potential for good or evil. The world has grown weary of the old state of affairs and is ready to be taught new lessons. What these lessons will be and the principles upon which they are based depend solely upon the teachers. We cannot afford to stand aside and allow others to lead the way along paths that our American traditions make us realize to be dangerous. There is a spirit of service in the air and we must take the initiative in shaping its proper course. Government is not a permanent thing of definite lines and limits. It is a living force. We can make it what we will. The power is ours and ours is the duty to use that power unselfishly and well.

The Reconstruction Commission is to be commended for its work and the promise that its report contains. The people of the State and every right-minded citizen should take it as a sign pointing to a duty to be performed.

Boy, Page Dr. Walsh!

FRANCIS WHITEHILL

WHEN next the physicians and trustees of asylums in a western State assemble for their annual convention at the State capital, they should by all means have in their midst Dr. James J. Walsh to clear away the accumulated cobwebs of ignorance from their brains, to sweep their minds clean of long-cherished prejudices, to let the light of historical and scientific truth penetrate the dense darkness in which they grope. And, sad to relate, one who is a coreligionist of Dr. Walsh and a fellow-physician, requires the authoritative words of the sometime Fordham professor no less than do the non-Catholics with whom he is associated in asylum work.

A Catholic who is an asylum-trustee, and as such attends the yearly State conventions, complains that at these meetings there is almost invariably present a pretentious man of medicine who eulogizes modern asylums and care for the insane and takes occasion to condemn the superstition, ignorance and brutality of the Middle Ages in this regard.

Of course, in the Dark Ages, when the Catholic Church was supreme, they did not care for the insane in the excellent man-

ner in which we now care for them. In the days of medieval ignorance and superstition, before modern science and philanthropy took the unfortunates in hand, the lot of the insane was deplorable in the extreme.

Such sentences as these, uttered unctuously and with affected accent, in the hope of conveying an impression of superior knowledge, have for years adorned the orations delivered at these meetings. The Catholic doctor, physician at an asylum, evidently took it for granted that the rhetorical humbug was the truth, for he has frequently made sneering remarks about the Middle Ages, ridiculed the Crusades and ranged himself definitely on the side of ignorance and bigotry. He is a terrible example of what may happen to the Catholic who gets his education in none but secular schools and colleges, does not read *AMERICA* each week to keep correctly informed, and has not been reached by the only Catholic publication which would reach him, if it were in existence, the local Catholic daily paper.

The Catholic trustee was disturbed. He "hoped" the statements were not true. The Catholic newspaper man in whom he confided told him instantly and unhesitatingly that he had a right to do more than hope, a right to feel sure that the statements were false. For though the newspaper man had never come across any reference to the care for the insane in the Middle Ages, he felt instinctively that he was right. Neglect of the mentally diseased, much less brutal treatment of them, did not harmonize with what he had learned of medievalism from the "Thirteenth, Greatest of Centuries," from Father Husslein's and other articles in *AMERICA*, from Ralph Adams Cram's recent books.

The scribe hied him to the "Catholic Encyclopedia." He has no set of his own, but, thanks to the Knights of Columbus, he had access to this source of authoritative information at the public library. In Volume VIII he found triumphant justification of his position, ample material, presented by none other than Dr. Walsh, with which to confound the asylum orators. This is a part of what he read:

During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries hospital-care of the sick of all kinds and nursing fell to the lowest ebb in history. Institutions and care for the insane not only shared in this decadence, but were its worst features. Because of this, many writers have declared that proper care for the insane and suitable institutions developed only in recent generations. As the Church had much to do with humanitarian efforts of all kinds in the past, it has been made a subject of reproach to her. As a matter of fact, the Church, from the earliest times, arranged for the care of the insane, and some of the arrangements anticipated some of the most important advances of modern times.

He read considerably more on the subject, and then came upon this sentence: "All of this interesting and valuable provision for the care of the insane, as well as the monastic establishments in which they were received, disappeared with the Reformation."

To be able to reassure the doubting Catholic trustee

and arraign the un-Catholic asylum physician gave the newspaper man much joy, but no pharisaical sense of superiority or personal merit. For if certain fortunate circumstances had not led him to the reading of *AMERICA* each week and through it to the reading of books on the Middle Ages; if he were dependent on the secular press for information on this subject, he would doubtless have been merely hopeful like the trustee, perhaps as worthy of commiseration as the physician. He is grateful beyond expression for what little he knows concerning medieval days. To him they formed, despite their shortcomings, the most glorious period in history, a time in which he would gladly have lived. Indeed, he bears a chronic, personal grudge against Dr. Martin Luther and his associate villains who made a continuation of medievalism impossible and plunged the world into the misery, gloom and ugliness of modernity.

The physician, it is to be hoped, is solitary in his un-Catholic position. But he is by no means alone in lacking knowledge of much that every Catholic should know. Medievalism is only one of the subjects falsified by bigoted ignorance, only one of the many things which our enemies turn into traps for unwary Catholics.

How are we going to remedy the situation? We know how lamentably few are the Catholics who subscribe to such periodicals as *AMERICA*, read such books as Dr. Walsh's, read a Catholic publication of any kind. Pleadings for support of the Catholic press, for the perusal of Catholic books, even when they can be drawn from parish or public library, might be continued from now until doomsday without material effect. The secular local daily newspaper will continue to form almost the sole reading matter in the vast majority of Catholic homes, and even in those occasionally visited by a Catholic publication, the daily influence of the secular inevitably predominates over all others.

Is it not plain, then, that we must supplant the secular daily paper? And to supplant means to put something in the place formerly occupied by something else. We must put Catholic dailies in the place now occupied by the secular dailies. Then the truth, in news columns and "feature" articles, will be read. Lectures will not do the work. In November, in a city of 500,000 people, Dr. Walsh had an audience of about 300. The next morning's newspapers printed utterly futile accounts of the splendid address, and consequently only the 300 people who heard him, not the hundreds of thousands of newspaper readers, received any benefit from his visit to that city.

If we had dailies of our own, the edition following Dr. Walsh's lecture would give all Catholics at least something like a truthful, adequate résumé of what he had said.

In another way, too, the highest quality of information could then be brought into the homes of our people. The secular press makes frequent use of "feature" articles which are welcomed by its readers. We could,

if we had our own dailies, give our readers articles as vividly illustrated, as "catchily" arranged, written in the same "popular" style as those in the secular papers, but unlike those, serving the ends of truth and decency. And these "features" would be welcomed into the homes of our people.

When we have a chain of Catholic daily newspapers, the managing editor of any one of them can bellow at the printer's devil: "Boy, page Dr. Walsh! Get out his syndicated article on 'Asylums in the Middle Ages.' I want to run it along with the report of the asylum trustees convention."

Religion in the British Army

A. HILLIARD ATTERIDGE

IN the old days of small professional armies, the soldier was a man apart. Many years of his life were spent with the regiment; he formed a distinct class, and it would have been misleading to attempt to form from his ideas and practice a general judgment on the religious and moral condition of the nation whose uniform he wore. Modern war, based on the principle of "the nation in arms," has changed all this. In a great war lasting for years and putting into the field a considerable part of the nation's manhood, taking too in the wide sweep of compulsory service men of every class, the army represents the whole of the people.

It is this fact that gives a special interest and value to the results of two elaborate inquiries into the religious condition of the British army during the great war. These results are summed in two recently published books: "The Army and Religion, An Enquiry and Its Bearing Upon the Religious Life of the Nation," with a preface by the Bishop of Winchester and "Catholic Soldiers, by Sixty Chaplains and Others," edited by the Rev. C. Plater, S.J. The first of these volumes deals with the non-Catholics and is the result of an inquiry carried out by a committee which represented all the various non-Catholic religious bodies and collected hundreds of reports from chaplains, war-workers, officers and soldiers. Only incidentally it refers to the Catholic soldiers. The second book supplements it. Unlike the first it makes no attempt to sum up the evidence, but merely marshals it under a number of heads, leaving the reader to form his own conclusions.

There is a startling contrast between the effect of the evidence collected in these two books. In both of them we get plain statements of facts by first-hand witnesses. In both the number of witnesses, and the wide scope of the searching questions they were asked to answer, make the evidence remarkably complete. And no one can read them without the inevitable conviction that the Catholic Church has secured a real vital hold upon its people and exerted a living influence for good upon them; while, in contrast with this, the non-Catholic churches have failed almost entirely to do anything of the kind with those who give them a professed allegiance. "A tree is known by its fruits," and this Gospel-test has here been applied to the effect of various religious systems on the lives of

millions. About the answer given by the great experiment there can be no doubt. It is all the more striking because the non-Catholic committee with candid honesty admits the terrible failure, while the Jesuit editor of the reports on the Catholic life of the army does not even attempt to sum up the result, but leaves the facts to speak for themselves because there is no need to insist on their obvious significance.

In the British army every man's religion is noted when he joins, and this becomes part of his personal army record. The great majority of the recruits register themselves as "Church of England." This often means very little. If a man does not claim to be "Roman Catholic" or "Presbyterian" and shows any hesitation about declaring his religious classification, the sergeant who helps him fill up his paper puts him down "Church of England." A man must have a religion in the army; unbelief is not officially recognized. There is a story, which may be quite true, of the young lieutenant who told his colonel: "I have advanced views, Sir, and do not accept the dogmas of any organized church," which called forth the colonel's prompt reply: "That won't do in the army. See that you are provided with some kind of a religion before church parade next Sunday."

So the ranks that form for church parade contain numbers of men who have never gone near a church in their civil life. They are there because it is a "parade." They join in the hymns because most soldiers are ready to join in singing of any kind. That is all it amounts to. The war has brought the chaplains into closer touch with the men. Let it be said to their honor that chaplains of all denominations have tried to do their best for the soldiers, but from the non-Catholic reports it is terribly clear that among the "Church of England" and non-conformist soldiers the results have been disappointing. The same evidence comes from hospital nurses and from officers and non-commissioned officers. Among the old soldiers mobilized in 1914, the voluntary recruits of the first stage of the war, and the hundreds of thousands of conscripts of its later years, the experience was the same. The vast majority neither knew nor cared anything about religion. They could not care because for the most part they were utterly ignorant of even elementary Christian ideals. There is abundant evidence that aggressive unbelief,

atheism and the rest, was very rare. There was a vague belief in God and a future life, Christ was a mere name or a far-off historic figure, and there was no link between belief and conduct. Here are some typical extracts from the evidence:

From the joint report of six chaplains: "The men reverence Christ but do not regard Him as living. The living Christ is even less realized than the Cross."

Report of a chaplain with North of England soldiers: "I fear that apart from what the padre may say on Sundays, with the exception of the Christians (*i. e.*, the religious minority) Christ does not figure in their lives at all. The Cross and the living Christ for the keen Christian man mean everything—for the semi-keen something—for the rest nothing. Keen 10 per cent, semi-keen, 10 per cent, rest 80 per cent."

From an officer of the Guards: "There is an absolute lack of knowledge of the fundamental truths of Christianity, and of the Bible and the power of prayer. This is greatly due to the lack of spiritual education."

From a senior Church of England chaplain: "I do not find much serious thought about the bigger problems. A few men are thinking hard and far. . . . The men's knowledge of Christianity is very vague indeed. It is mostly memories of Sunday and day-school remembered very vaguely and very verbally and very partially. Many stop thinking at fourteen. Education has been rotten with materialism. It wants ideals, religion, religious men and women as teachers."

There are frequent references to this result of the British system of schools without any definite religious teaching. The fact is that the great majority of the people are taught little or nothing about Christianity in their school-days, and in after-life are not in touch with any religious organization. One comes frequently upon the view expressed thus by one writer: "The soldier has got religion. I am not sure that he has got Christianity." An examination of detailed evidence seems to show that this "soldier's religion" means a vague belief in God and a future life, a sense of almost pagan fatalism—"if a man's number is up, a bullet will find him" and the like—a strong sense that a man must do his duty as a soldier, and the idea that if he is killed in battle it will be well with him hereafter no matter what his life has been, an idea described rightly by one chaplain as more like the old Norseman's or Moslem's faith than that of Christianity. "The message of Christianity has never reached the great majority of the men at all," writes an officer of a London regiment. The effect of Sunday-school teaching seems to come out chiefly in the knowledge of some hymns, and the remembrance of some Bible texts, often sadly misused. Thus one reporter notes: "An indication, in another line, of misunderstanding of Christianity is the frequent quotation of 'an eye for an eye,' etc., as justifying the extremest measures of reprisals. It is enough for many that the maxim is in the Bible to justify its literal application."

The reporter does not, as he might have done, remind his readers that the Saviour quoted the maxim in order to lay down the new law of forgiveness and make the old maxim null for all future time.

But Christianity, as presented to the soldiers, seems to have had little practical bearing on the realities of life, and scant offer of effective help to them to do better. One zealous artillery officer tells how, after talking to his men of Christian ideals, and exciting their interest, he was startled by one of them saying to him in the language of the barrack: "But when you do go to Church the bloody thing they offer you is the most damned insipid thing imaginable"; and he adds: "Don't bother about the awful language. It was the tragic cry of a soul that had asked the Church for bread and been given a stone."

Of course there is a brighter side. There are men, non-Catholic officers and men, who came into the war with high Christian ideals and were faithful to them, and there were others to whom the grim reality of ever present peril of death brought a thoughtful mood and a seeking for religious help. Even among the men who had no idea of Christianity there was again and again generous self-sacrificing heroism under the unrecognized influence of the Christian tradition. Thus we hear of ragged battle-worn men, in driving rain, finding some wounded comrades, giving their great coats to the poor fellows, and going hungry in order to provide them with food. There was instinctive prayer in sudden danger. There was often among the wildest spirits reverence for the faith they neither understood nor practised. But the general evidence and the verdict upon it is disheartening. A second paper will tell the Catholic story.

The Negro Problem and Priest Patriots

EDWARD F. MURPHY

NOT the least serious of the problems that are causing our Uncle Sam unprecedented scalp-scratching is that which "alarmed Jefferson and baffled Lincoln."

Many of the ills of the world, like most of the attractions, are but skin-deep; but, on that very account, they are the more depressing. In manners as well as in morals, the modern era sets unconscionable store on appearances. From the sage of Wittenberg's fervid doctrine of superficial justification down to our own Rupert Hughes' frank "What Will People Say?" the sanctity of surface had been very piously advanced and quite plenteously accepted. It makes no matter that chaos obtain beneath, the outside, the visible, must be polished and impeccable.

Then God pity the negro! What though his heart is human, even as yours and mine? His surface repels. Unpardonable is the crime of pigment.

Milady of the Caucasian lilies can smear her countenance more copiously with colors than even a squaw would consider seemly, purchasing her complexion by the

wholesale, rendering the distinction in appearance between chorus-girl and kitchen-type negligible, and turning our boulevards into the semblance of a cabaret. Her surface is cosmetically correct, and custom approves, but the negress who uses the hue which the Creator, and not Colgate or any other enterprising capitalizer of facial folly, chose to bestow, is shocking.

Recently there was a vasty gas attack about "making the world safe for democracy." Weariedly the wise-aces soon sought variety in changing the over-done slogan into "making democracy safe for the world." But noises from Chicago and Washington would suggest that still another version is in order.

Why not start to make the world more safe for that brilliant but elusive democratic era by making our own America less unsafe for it? If a notable number of citizens are severed from their rights, democracy dies. The times are "out of joint." When in the shadow of the capitol at Washington, a race is swept with the fires of hate because of the excesses of an insignificant fraction of it; when the State which boasts the birth of the Great Emancipator is shamed with the blood of the emancipated; when Valdosta, Georgia, sickens us with the inconceivable crime of disembowelling a negro woman, and Dyersburg is gory with the deed of gouging out an offending Ethiopian's eyes; when the reign of King Lynch is rampant in Dixie; when Representative Carraway of Arkansas with much assurance introduces into the House a bill prohibiting negroes from enlisting in the army and navy, and providing for the discharge in sixty days of negroes now in service; when despite all this, Americans "blurb" their "sophomorics" on democracy; the face of Olympus is split from ear to ear with tragic mirth.

The fact is forgotten by soap-box bellowers who think with their mouths and by hack scribes who ponder with their pens, that democracy implies something more and mightier than hurling epithets at the Kaiser and hoisting flags at the sun. Autocracy is a Lernaean Hydra, to lop off one of whose heads is not to establish democracy. True and pure democracy can never be, until a great intellectual and moral awakening is.

Likely our country is equipped for the blessed popular period so far as mental acquirement and requirement are concerned, the Smith-y pessimism notwithstanding. But this is certain to those who refuse to wrap their brains in a roseate cloud of optimism; the heart of America is rent with the wrong sentiments. Economists and sociologists have had their say, and delivered themselves of it glowingly and well. Beneath the silvery Atlantis which they have spun for us from their gifted brains, the caissons of human passion have been left undisturbed. Modern theories have painstakingly informed us how to remedy conditions of the human being, but have notably neglected a formula to reform the human being himself. Or if a blessed few of them have extended so far as personal reformation, they still have

not been able to reach down into the human heart, where the great cause of unlovely facts lies, and implant charity and justice. Man's central organ cannot be legislated or coerced into Utopia.

And so it is that at any time the glorious structure of material ideals may be wholly destroyed or woefully disfigured by an outburst of immorality. Chicago and Washington are recent evidences that liberty, fraternity and equality are myths, unless founded on the rock of Christian morals. "A new commandment I give unto you: Love one another."

But is the colored man prepared for the precious privileges of democracy? More pertinently still, are we prepared to yield them to him?

The clergy and other beneficent agencies of the country are doubtless doing their best to fan the flames of Christian generosity and justice in Columbia's soul. And a handful of missionaries down in the Southland are heroically striving to fit the black man for the wonderful day of entrance into the possession of his birthright. Patriots as well as priests, these evangelizers are doing more to solve the negro problem than most of the lusty protesters combined. They are penetrating the recesses of the negro heart, expunging the evil elements that make for racial weakness and unsucces, and sowing the pure principles of the Gospel which must needs bring forth good fruit in due season. Laboring solely for love, they preach no hatred, and often serve as "the tie that binds" between the South and the erstwhile enslaved. Their sane counsel calms the inflammable tendencies of these oppressed people who, eating of the fruit of the tree of knowledge, find their eyes open to the injustice practised upon them and their bosoms embroiled with bitterness. They convince the colored folk that racial regeneration rather than resentment will hasten the coronation of Lincoln's proclamation of '63. They remind them that opposition and oppression may be made to serve as stimulants to educational and moral progression, whereas lack of all adversity might produce retrogression. They bend the Ethiopian head in reverence before the inscrutable fact that Providence permits races, like individuals, to carry the Cross; but they mingle patience with ambition and vitalize it with hope. The resurrection of Christ followed the crucifixion; the exaltation of Ethiopia is a fact of the future. Such is the service of the Fathers of St. Joseph's Society, and of the other devoted workers who feel that the strong but gentle and patient arm of the Church can surely do much to raise the colored people of America to their rightful place in human affairs on the longed-for level of democracy.

The national value of this labor is indubitable. Not the red flag but the Cross is the symbol with which they inspire the black man; not to passion but to peace, not to revolution but to advancement, not against country but for it, not away from democracy but on to the true democracy.

Surely these religious patriots, genuine benefactors of the Stars and Stripes, should not have to beg for the support of their Catholic brethren in the North whose love of God and country passes as unquestioned; especially now that the seriousness of the negro problem is so plainly revealed, and the merit of true missionary spirit in this regard is so evident. Are the piety and patriotism of a pastor who would earnestly discourage a boy's purpose to devote his life to the negro missions even remotely unimpeachable? And what about the religion and patriotism of him or her who deems a penny or a nickel sufficient for the annual collection for the home missions? Such an ungenerous attitude necessarily retards the reward of the total self-sacrifice of the reapers in the South, and has its effect towards withholding the fingers of time from opening wide the doors of the rosy day of real American democracy.

COMMUNICATIONS

(Letters as a rule should not exceed six-hundred words.)

British War Losses and War Strength

To the Editor of AMERICA:

In a book reviewed on page 66 of AMERICA for November 8, 1919, there is a statement that, according to an official publication, the British combatant forces in France throughout the war averaged only half a million, and the total British losses were 900,000 men. These statements were certainly very wide of the mark and misleading. As to losses, the returns issued on February 24, 1919, give these figures:

British losses (i.e., losses of troops raised in Great Britain and Ireland):

	Officers.	Other ranks.	Total.
Killed and died of wounds....	30,807	466,831	507,638
Wounded	76,132	1,532,552	1,608,684
Total casualties.....	106,939	1,999,383	2,115,322
Dominion and Indian troops:			
Killed and died of wounds....	7,602	168,703	176,305
Wounded	17,125	421,402	438,527
Totals	24,727	590,105	604,832

Total casualties, British, Dominion and Indian troops, 2,781,154 killed and wounded. Adding missing and presumed dead, the terrible total rises to 2,882,954. On November 11, 1918, the day of the armistice, the British troops on the western front alone were 1,718,000. On the same day the British troops on the other fronts (Italy, Salonika, Syria, Mesopotamia) numbered 3,500,000, exclusive of the Indian army, making a total on the war fronts of 5,218,000 officers and men.

London.

A. HILLIARD ATTERIDGE.

[This letter but adds to the confusion of British "official records." The figures criticised are based on the chart to be found in "Fields of Victory." Mrs. Humphry Ward, the author of the volume, declares the graph official and states, moreover, that it is published by the kind permission of General Lawrence, Chief of the General Staff.—THE REVIEWER.]

The Italian Problem

To the Editor of AMERICA:

In his communication of December 13, G. F. leaves the fairy realms of theory and alights upon the firm ground of practicality with a candid question: "Cannot somebody take thought and outline a plan for saving the children who are slipping from us

by the score, principally through settlement houses and such like institutions?" It is worse than useless, it is detrimental to waste time appointing investigating committees to ferret out the cause, striving to place the blame on the shoulders of those responsible for the religious indifference of a large percentage of Italians in the United States. Better far will it prove if, once the distemper is recognized, we devote our concerted energies to the application of a good home-remedy that has been tested by experience and has proved its potency to restore to the patient his spiritual health and vigor.

Now that the cannon is silent, the peace-time slogan is raised: "Americanize the immigrant." The field of public opinion, or rather public agitation, is occupied at present by the social uplifter and political opportunist. Every reformer, from senator to spinster, has discovered some mechanical contrivance to pump pure red American blood into the veins of the "common people," suffering from the post-bellum malady called by diagnosticians economic, social, political, religious anemia. Since the aliens among us suffer most from adulterated European blood, they are embraced most tenderly and adopted most affectionately into the blue-blooded families of social and political reformers. Since the Italian is catalogued among the orphan aliens, he is blessed with frequent visits from the walking delegates of social-uplift organizations. The proselyter, with beaming countenance, dispels the gloom that enfolds the Italian home by his gracious presence. In one hand he carries bread, in the other the book of the Covenant. Physical regeneration is promised through pure, American-cooked food, and sound nationalism may be imbibed from the unpolluted fount of the English language, the King James edition of the Bible. The political drum-major of the patriotic civic society calls and informs the alien that he will become one hundred per cent American if he falls in line behind the big political band-wagon. In the dead of night the Socialistic leader unfolds to the gaping immigrant the magic wonders contained in his secret organization. When capitalist and churchmen are swept away by deluge, the poor man will once more enter the garden of paradise. During these days, while reform is rampant, it will save the devoted reconstructionists much precious labor if they are once convinced of the truth that the Italian robbed of his Catholic faith cannot be remodeled into a good Protestant or a good American, but when so denaturalized will furnish good raw material for the revolutionary radical who will not fail to inject into him burning hatred of all religion and every form of government.

What remedy, then, do we offer to offset the sinister influences brought to bear from every side upon the Italian immigrant who comes a perfect stranger to this great land of promise? It is conceded by most who have tried the experiment that the Sunday school does not solve the problem. Every parish, we are told, should build and maintain its own parochial school. Were this the panacea for the present evil, parishes blessed with Catholic schools should have no Italian problem. Few indeed will be found to make this admission. Moreover, when there is question of a parish school, difficulties of a practical nature must be faced. What Italian parish can build a school spacious enough to accommodate the ever-increasing numbers of its children? Are we to rest content with the school that affords a Catholic education to a certain number, while the majority, it may be, is cast out to the public schools? Again, where is the Italian parish to obtain the revenue necessary to support a school adequate for its ever-increasing needs?

To meet this difficulty, Mgr. Lavelle, vicar-general to the late Cardinal Farley, initiated the movement of opening centers, as they are called, where public-school children could receive religious instruction during school-periods without interference with the regular work of the classroom. This system, wherever established, has proved most successful, especially where the center is under the direct supervision of the parish priest assisted by a

well-trained corps of teachers. Experience shows that the children come to the church-school, as they call the center, with good will, and the clearest proof of its success is the fact that the average attendance is on a par with that of the regular classes. This method of religious instruction continues as long as the child attends public school.

The large Catholic organizations would do well to give their assistance to this work, which has vindicated its claim to their support by the test of past experience. A sound investment for the money they are at present expending to "Americanize the alien" would be financial support enabling parish priests to build centers composed of ten or fifteen rooms located in convenient places in our large Italian parishes. If this assistance is forthcoming, it can be guaranteed that our Italian children will go forth a veritable legion of honor, well-instructed in the traditions and doctrines of their holy Faith. Nurtured carefully in their tender years, they will later prove themselves impervious to the poisoned arrows of social or religious propaganda. The centers thus formed in different parts of the parish would serve a double purpose. In the evening their doors could be thrown open to the young people of the parish, who are at work during the day. With libraries and suitable courses, working boys and girls would be encouraged to continue their education. Clubs could be formed where the young toilers would find congenial companionship and spend their evenings amid beneficial surroundings. The clubs thus formed would supply the nucleus of large sodalities. The Italian, by nature emotional, is keen to appreciate the least kindness, and when religion leaves the precincts of the church and extends him a helping hand to meet the daily difficulties that beset his path, he in turn will cling with all the ardor of his warm heart to his religion. This work, to be successful, should be under the direction of devoted, self-sacrificing men and women, volunteers, if possible, though better results will be obtained if salaries are given. The initial financial outlay might come from Catholic organizations, but in a short time the parish would be able to carry on the work unaided.

"The grown people are, I feel, hopeless," declares G. F. We feel compelled to deny this assertion. Establish parish centers; throw open the church doors; give to the Italians sound preaching and good music; and before long the churches will be filled and the altar-rail crowded. The old folks will not be slow to register their appreciation for the kindness shown their little ones. In fact, the Italian children hold out the brightest hopes for the religious improvement of their parents. By rendering practical assistance in the manner we have outlined, instead of carping and wrangling over their present deplorable condition, the Italians will soon take an honored place in the ranks of their co-religionists, and will write into the Church history of America heroic virtues of their people that will vie with the immortal chapters penned by their noble ancestors in their native land.

New York.

JOSEPH A. CAFFUZZI.

To the Editor of AMERICA:

I have read with much interest the discussion following my note in AMERICA of August 16, printed under the caption, "Christianizing the Italians." That a special effort is needed if a majority of the Italians in this country are to be saved to the Church has not been gainsaid. By whom this effort should be made and what form it should take is the important question. Mr. Horgan commends the work of the "Missionary Servants of the Holy Trinity." Their work cannot be too highly commended, but its continuance depends on nothing more permanent than, to put it baldly, the good digestion of the pastor. The pastor in whose parish they have now been working for about a year is in excellent health and long may he be spared. But in spite of his co-operation they have had some very hard jolts, and few women would have the zeal to continue toiling in an enterprise

that has met with so little appreciation, so meager support and so wanton destruction as has theirs. That the blessing of God is on their work is evident. But I do not think the solution of the problem is with them, no matter how materially they may aid in it.

One of your correspondents wrote: "I do not know what the conditions are in South Orange." As the conditions come very near to the solution of the problem, it is with pleasure I report them: The total population of the village of South Orange is 6,000. The foreign population is 410, of which 400 are Italians. One-third of the Italian families own real estate, one-third own their own business. Of the 122 births in 1918, 30 were Italian. All are nominal Catholics and attend no other church, and 12 families attend the Church of Our Lady of Sorrows. When the Presbyterian church recently made a drive for "one hundred new members in our Sunday school," they found only 15 children without church affiliations. Of the 136 Italian children of grammar school age, 86 attend the parochial school. And if you go to the children's Mass, it is a difficult matter to tell which are which.

May I be allowed to say that some of us seem to be in danger of rotting with pride while gloating over the achievements of our ancestors in this country rather than going out to help save the souls of those who need to be helped? Would it not be well to think at times of the Coliseum and remember that the "Roman" Catholics also had noble ancestors?

South Orange, N. J.

BLANCHE MARY DILLON.

Pronunciation of Irish Historical Names

To the Editor of AMERICA:

In reading Irish history we are constantly meeting Gaelic names like Eochaidh Muighmeadhmoín, Toirdhealbhaich, Muirthemne, Tain Bo Chuailgne, which, we learn, are pronounced Yohee Moyvane, Teralá, Moorevne and Tawn Bo Hoo-illn-yeh, but this information is no help with the next name we meet, yet to talk intelligently on Irish history one should be able at least to pronounce the proper names. In learning Irish one of the chief difficulties is the pronunciation, but the following rules will cover ordinary cases:

The Irish language lays stress on a difference between broad and slender vowels and consonants. The broad vowel is a long or accented vowel and it is written with an acute accent; the slender vowel is unaccented or short. A consonant in the same syllable with a broad vowel, or diphthong or triphthong containing an accented vowel, is said to be broad, and a consonant in a syllable with a slender vowel is slender.

The broad or accented vowels are pronounced like the continental vowels except the á, which is very broad, like the aw in law. Mac is pronounced Mawk. The slender or unaccented vowel is pronounced like the same vowel when short in English—a like o in not, e like e in let, i like i in hit, o like o in done, u like u in put.

The diphthongs and triphthongs are not so simple. When a broad vowel is combined with another vowel, as ái or éi, the accented vowel is pronounced broad and is stressed, and the slender vowel is almost slurred—ái is ah-eh, with the stress on the penult; éo, however, is pronounced yo, and úi, oo. Iui also is pronounced oo. The slender diphthongs, æ ao and eu are sounded like a in James; ai and ea like a in bat; ea, however, before an aspirated b or m, that is bh or mh, is oo; ei and oi, as e in let; io and ui, as i in hit; ia is ee-ah; ua is oo-ah. Aoi is pronounced ee; eoi is usually yo or sometimes like o in note; iai is ee-ah; iui is oo; uai is oo-ah.

B, f, p and m before diphthongs beginning with a broad or accented vowel take an mw sound. Máol is mwael. In bp the p is silent, in bhf and mhf the f is silent, in mb the b is silent. S with an accented vowel is like a hissing English s. When it is with an unaccented vowel it is sh, except in ís, a form of

the verb to be. A-gus is og-us, inis is inish, Sean is Shawn. S before b, m or p slender is like an English s. T before a, o, or u is th. Tu is thu, ta is tha. Slender consonants have a sound somewhat like y set in. Ciuin is kyoön, tir is tcheer. In words beginning with ts the s is silent—the name of the river tSiuir is toor. Aspirated consonants are written either with a dot over the letter or with an accompanying h.

Dh and gh at the middle and end of a word are silent, and at the end of a syllable they lengthen a preceding slender vowel, e.g., the ending ighidh is pronounced ee-ee. Before silent dh and gh the diphthongs ai, oi and ui when slender are pronounced ee; uai becomes oo-ee. Ceal-laigh is kal-ye. Adh and agh in the middle of a word, when followed by a vowel, are pronounced like ei in height. Raghallaigh is rei-all-yeh. Dh and gh at the beginning of a syllable have a peculiar guttural sound made by keeping the tongue away from the palate, and must be heard to be learned.

C unaspirated s like the English k. Loch Ce is Lough Kay. Ch broad is like the Greek letter chi, or gh in lough. Seachran is not shockran, but schachrawn. Ch slender is somewhat like hy. Micheal is mee-hyawl. There are a few exceptions to this rule—chiana is pronounced hana; chugam, chugat and chuige have an h sound.

Bh and mh when final or slender are pronounced as v. Lamha is lauva. When broad they are w. A mhúirnin is a woorn-yeen. Abh and amh are pronounced like ou in mouth, and so are eabh and eamh, although sometimes these two latter combinations are pronounced as oo; ubh and umh are oo; obh and omh are long o. Fh is always silent—fhuil is pronounced il. Dl and ln are ll and nn; codladh is culyah or cul-you.

In combinations of consonants with liquids and with b and g the Irish insert a short a or u. Cormac is pronounced kur-a-moc, orm is ur-am, corn is cur-an, scolb is skul-ab. Albain is ol-a-bain, cnoc is kun-uc, cnamh is kun-auv, balbh is bol-av. The combinations nch and rch insert this a or u before the ch. Donnchadha is dun-a-cha, Murchadh is mur-a-cha, Murchadha is mur-a-choo-a.

A good word to analyze as to pronunciation is bhféicheamh-naibh, which is sounded as vay-eh-hoon-iv. The bh is v, the f is silent after the aspirated b, the ch is h, the eamh is oo, the ai is i, and bh is v. Other words like this are geathughadh and laetheamhail, pronounced goo-oo-a and lae-hoo-il.

Philadelphia.

AUSTIN O'MALLEY, M. D.

Masonry and Prohibition

To the Editor of AMERICA:

A great many people, with the writer, have been puzzling their brains over the almost magical success of the wave of fanaticism propagated by the Anti-Saloon League. It would seem that it had but to crack the whip and the animals, State and national, jumped to obey. But why? How explain the jumping over party lines, the forward rush of an utterly unpopular movement, the sudden conversion to abstinence of hitherto hardened drinkers? Of course, there was plainly enough Methodism in their madness, but that, like all Protestantism, was too decadent a force to account for the Anti-Saloon League's enormous success. To assign it to the striving of the American people after a high moral standard in the teeth of our late universal wave of profiteering, is to move even a fool to laughter. Yet "it leaps to the eyes" that some enormous political cause only is adequate to this enormous effect. Try Masonry as a key to the puzzle!

First, be it known that a greater number of Methodists are Masons than any other sect can boast. Here is a leading clue to why Methodists and Masons should be behind the same movement. Some one will laughingly say: "Have the Methodists then converted all the Masons to Prohibition?" On the contrary, it is not the Methodists who are using the Masons

but the Masons who are using the Methodists. Masonry has long seen that there must be a political convulsion in this country and the present two-fold division of parties be wiped from the board before it can play its game. As things stand its forces are too evenly entrenched against each other behind strong party lines. It sought for some issue which would completely smash the old party alignment. When the Anti-Saloon League put forward the Prohibition issue, it found its bomb. Hence, as I believe, instructions to Masonry to stand behind Prohibition. Preposterous? Let us see how many strange mysteries become clear on this hypothesis. It explains why a Democratic Congress foisted Prohibition on the country and a Republican Congress drastically legislated to enforce it, when ordinarily the two parties are only too anxious for any political stick to beat each other with.

It will also explain why State Legislatures, Democratic and Republican, in many cases ratified the Amendment against the expressed wish or outspoken opposition of their constituents, when ordinarily they have their ear to the ground for the rumblings of such opposition. It will explain why both parties refuse to make it an issue in the coming election, when they know there is no more live question. It will explain why the Anti-Saloon League was so grandiloquently confident that it was going to make the whole world dry, forgetting that the Masonry of other lands had no such fish to fry in backing the Anti-Saloon League as has the Masonry of this country. It will explain why all the story magazines ran Prohibition tales, which were neither artistic, romantic nor calculated to increase their circulation. It will explain the sudden fervor for righteousness in the other fellow, infecting a Congress which laughed out loud at the motion to confiscate private stocks, and the arrant hypocrisy behind the whole movement. And nought else will explain.

But one must be very careful, when the devil deals, not to overplay the cards. Already the plans are going astray. The Anti-Saloon League knows that the vision of a guileless and crimeless world under Prohibition is "the tender dream of a day that is dead," and the Masons may find that in clearing the chessmen from the board for a new game they threw away the board with the chessmen.

Baltimore.

J. M. PRENDERGAST.

Catechists and Non-Catholics

To the Editor of AMERICA:

I have seen, on different occasions, in the Catholic press, references to the excellent work done by catechists among Pagans, and I have often wondered why the Church does not make use of laymen and lay-women, similarly instructed, for the conversion of non-Catholics. They would be very useful, especially where missions to non-Catholics have been given, for they could visit the homes of those who were most earnest in attending the conferences, and could strengthen their interest, which may not be strong enough to overcome either human respect or the other obstacles that might prevent them from calling on the pastor. Such help would be most welcome to those pastors who are too busy to do such work themselves. There should be little or no trouble in getting recruits for this kind of work, for it would be very congenial to many of our numerous converts, and especially to the converted clergymen, who for one reason or other cannot go on to the priesthood. In many instances converts would be able to do more effective work amongst non-Catholics, because they would know better their point of view. In any case, in view of the dearth of priests, and the fact that many non-Catholics are favorably disposed towards the Church on account of the glorious achievements of many of her children during the war, it seems to me that the matter is worth considering.

Toronto, Canada.

J. McFORTUNE.

A M E R I C A

A · CATHOLIC · REVIEW · OF · THE · WEEK

SATURDAY, JANUARY 10, 1920

Entered as second-class matter, April 15, 1909, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 29, 1918.

Published weekly by The America Press, New York.

President, RICHARD H. TIERNEY; Secretary, JOSEPH HUSSLEIN;
Treasurer, CHARLES J. DEANE.

SUBSCRIPTIONS, POSTPAID:
United States, 10 cents a copy; yearly, \$4.00
Canada, \$4.50 Europe, \$5.00

Address:

THE AMERICA PRESS, 173 East 83d Street, New York, N. Y., U. S. A.

CABLE ADDRESS: CATHREVIEW

Stamps should be sent for the return of rejected manuscripts.

The Index for Volume XXI of AMERICA is now ready. Those who desire copies should notify the Business Manager and the copies asked for will be mailed at once.

The Catholic's Vote

AS the third decade of the twentieth century begins, the mutterings of the storm of war are still heard, and a new enemy is at the gate. Materialism, a denial of the existence and need of the supernatural, is the enemy against which the world must now battle. The danger is doubled, since the world does not recognize this destructive spirit as an enemy, but rather hails it as the leader into the new and promised land of true liberty.

In the United States, the most dangerous form which this degradation has assumed is found in the growing worship of the State as the source of all human rights. The part which the Catholic citizen must assume in the coming battle is, therefore, of tremendous importance. Catholic philosophy alone can point out the proper relations of the State and the citizen and insist upon their maintenance. All lawful authority, according to the Catholic view, is from God, whether that authority be exercised by prince, potentate, president, or by some poor and ignorant father in his home. When the State confines itself to the exercise of its lawful authority, resistance to the State is resistance to God in whose name alone the State can act. Hence there is no servility, no degradation, in obedience to law. It is not submission to man, not even submission to the community, but to God.

On the other hand, Catholic teaching rejects as degrading to man, made in the image of God, any theory of statecraft which regards him as a mere unit in a huge governmental machine. God, not the State, made man. Man has rights and duties, anterior both in time and nature to the State. The State did not give him these rights, and the State cannot take them away. The right

to marry and to found a family and the right to rule and train his children, are not conferred upon man by the State. They come from a source which the State cannot touch. The State which attempts to interfere with their just exercise, and still more, to abrogate them, is not only acting towards the destruction of good order in the community, but exceeding the warrant of its power.

A citizen who holds that he may do anything which he wishes to do, or has the physical power to do, generally ends in riot and wreck. The career of the State which adopts a like policy is strikingly similar. The Catholic citizen aware of his civic duties, can and must help to save the State from that fate. For the next ten years Congress and the State legislatures will be clogged with bills and resolutions. Many will attempt to enact into law rank invasions upon personal rights, and to shift to the State burdens which it should not carry. As it is easier to pick a sane man for office, than to restrain a Congressman whose mental caliber is measured by his zeal to establish a Federal Department for the Relief of Superannuated Cooks, the views of candidates at the polls must be carefully ascertained, with the purpose of keeping cranks and sciolists at home. The importance now to be attached to the vote can hardly be overestimated, and a very praiseworthy form of patriotism is an intelligent use of the elective franchise. Since its effects may be equally disastrous, today a stupid vote is almost as reprehensible as a dishonest vote.

Reunion's "Business Basis"

DISCUSSING the reunion of churches as a "business proposition," the *Catholic Herald* of India cleverly states the opposing Protestant and Catholic viewpoints thus:

The Protestant churches say: "We have got into a frightful mess, let us combine"; and the Catholic Church answers: "No, thanks." The Protestant Church abolished Apostolic authority and her faithful split into 360 sects; she abolished the Sacrifice of the Mass, and her faithful lost the sense of faith and religion; she abolished the obligation of going to church, and her faithful stayed at home; she set up private judgment, and her faithful threw up the Bible. Whereas none of these evils has invaded the Catholic Church, the Protestant Church, alarmed by the results, yet unable to retrace her steps and undo the mischief, appeals to the Catholic Church and expects her to amalgamate and join her bankrupt concern. The Catholic Church is very polite and sympathetic, but she is not a fool. . . . We do not want to hurt any one, we want to be clear. The attitude of the Catholic Church as explained above should offer no mystery to English Protestants who are at the same time business men, and these do not as a rule combine with firms whose names are in the gazette.

Reunion, therefore, considered, so to speak, as a business enterprise, would be almost wholly to Protestantism's advantage. For the sects by discarding the non-Catholic tenets that make them what they are, can then effect a "merger" with an age-old Church that has stood as firm as Gibraltar in every world-crisis and has a Divine promise that she will never be insolvent. Protestants who enter the Church will find placed fully at their

disposal her inexhaustible spiritual capital, her long and wide experience will assist them in making "gilt-edged" investments where thieves break not through and steal, her sage counsels will enable them to be a credit to her in whatever walk of life they move, and the proud sense of security and prestige they will feel at belonging to such a renowned and powerful organization as the Catholic Church will lead them to undertake, confident of success, the most difficult enterprises.

With the whole Christian world once more united in faith under the successor of him to whose loving care the Good Shepherd committed His entire flock, both lambs and sheep, bounds can scarcely be set to the spiritual conquests the Church will then make over the hosts of infidelity and sin. That this blessed consummation, the reunion of Christendom, may speedily be realized all our readers should join their prayers to those of the millions of Catholics and Protestants throughout the world who will observe from January 18, the Feast of St. Peter's Chair at Rome, until January 28, the Feast of St. Paul's Conversion, the Church Unity Octave.

The Deeper Motive

THERE is much talk in these days on the need of State regulation of a number of human activities, and most of it is worse than nonsense. A philosophy at the root of much present-day social disorder makes statute law, and usually as it is exemplified in sumptuary legislation, the standard of morality. If the law forbids, it's a sin; if the law is silent, do it if you can. Any observer who has passed his twenty-first birthday knows to what the acceptance of that standard leads. A man may shirk most of his duties to God, to himself and to his neighbor, and make himself an unfailing source of disorder throughout a long life, without falling afoul of the law. As a regulator of human affairs, legislature-made law does not go deep enough.

There is need to develop all the virtues that have the State for their sphere of action; but these virtues are as dust in a windy street unless back of them lie the strong and tender virtues of a family life based on the love of one man for one woman, and on their joyous and fearless acceptance of their common obligation to the children that are theirs.

So wrote one whose family life exemplified what he fearlessly preached, Theodore Roosevelt. But with all our law, what protection are we throwing around "the strong and tender virtues of family life"? An immorality which now finds defenders in presumed "respectable" quarters, makes homes impossible, and the scandalously lax divorce "laws" of all but two or three States, make the disruption of homes already established a matter of no greater difficulty than the utterance of perjuries to which hardened courts listen with indifference. To cap the climax of iniquity, eighty per cent of our children are in schools, which, as by law established, can recognize neither the existence of a Supreme Lawgiver, nor the possibility that we can know and do His will.

But let us not be utterly discouraged. We are progressing, not perhaps in the right direction, but progress is progress. The greatest of all social problems meets its solution on January 20. Not by law but by something much stronger than law, a constitutional amendment, we have made it absolutely impossible for a day-laborer to get so much as a glass of beer. An evil, compared with which race-suicide, divorce, and pagan education shine as virtues, is thus removed. All is well and the future is bright.

A Publisher and the Law

A NEW YORK publishing house, hitherto of fair reputation, is in the meshes of the law. Invoking a section of the penal code which is far more honored in the breach than in the observance, an indictment was secured against the firm and its president for printing and selling an immoral book. At the preliminary hearing, the indicted parties agreed to deliver all the copies of the book in their possession and the plates for printing it, to the New York Society for the Suppression of Vice, if the case were dropped. Possibly this might have been the best way of suppressing the book, but, from the legal point of view, the magistrate was fully justified in binding the defendants to appear before the Court of Special Sessions.

The only penalty which can be inflicted upon the publishing house is a fine, but the president, if found guilty, can be sentenced to a term in the penitentiary. The president's defense at the preliminary hearing was that he had not read the book either in manuscript or print and knew nothing about it. This plea was doubtless true, but the magistrate declined to accept it. It was not a defense in law, nor, it may be added, in common sense, yet it is an excuse much in favor with the indicted officers of corporations who usually allege that the doings of the companies with which they are associated are to them as a sealed book. But *qui facit per alium facit per se*, "what is done by my agent is attributable to me" is an axiom which ought to be as valid in law as it is in common sense. It may be taken for granted that had the publishing house undertaken a course causing a loss of money to its owners and directors, the president would have investigated the matter, or would have been dropped by the directors. When the company undertakes a course which may result in the debasing of public morality, the president should likewise be acquainted with all details. In the present instance, however, the president, who is also the treasurer of the company, knew nothing about the book, either before or after its publication. The defense appears exceedingly weak.

No doubt the publishers have learned a lesson which need not be accentuated by condemning the president, who is now actively engaged in the well-known New York game of "investigating" the moral status of certain city officials, to wear stripes. Yet, while the law knows nothing of revenge, nevertheless the infliction of

the law's just penalty might have an excellent effect on other publishers who are doing their best to corrupt public morals. Malefactors of great wealth regard a fine as nothing but a license to continue their evil work. A chain and a ball, and a nice heap of rock to be cracked, would probably not be regarded in the same light. "Freedom to print" has been deeply abused of late. It is high time to impress upon publishers in an unforgettable manner, that even "freedom to print" has limits.

Why Study American History?

ONE of the many lessons brought home by the war is the small part which the study of American history takes in our schools. Consequently, our young people are left unprotected against the propagandists who are trying to show that, after all, this Government of ours is founded on a mistake. England, gravely argue certain text-books, always treated the Colonies with the greatest tenderness, and what is written in the various bills of rights and declarations preceding the final and decisive Declaration of Independence, is mere rhetoric, phrases never credited even by the men who penned them. When in 1774 Washington wrote that he was not contending against the payment of a duty of three pence on tea, but against the principle of taxation without a real, as opposed to a virtual, representation, he was not speaking a love of liberty, but the landholder's love

of the power secured by wealth. So goes the story today. When these propagandists have succeeded in breaking down our traditional respect for the principles upon which American liberty is founded, the next generation will feel little compunction in breaking with the past, to set up new and unsound forms of government. Not without good reason did the Virginians of 1774 assert that liberty would perish without "a frequent recurrence to fundamental principles." The recurrence is proposed today, but only to show that the principles are unsound.

The present year witnesses the third centenary of the landing of the Mayflower Pilgrims. This great occasion has been seized for the purposes of propaganda, and the schools of the country have been requested to observe the centenary "fittingly." Nothing could be better, if the word "fittingly" is properly interpreted. But are we to understand that the "Mayflower" was purchased by a loving mother country and given into the hands of the Pilgrims, that the blessings of liberty, civil and religious, might be spread throughout the New World? Thus is history written today. Propaganda triumphs, but truth mourns. The Pilgrims left England because they could find in it neither justice nor truth, and whatever their failings, their best gift to their descendants was a love of that home rule which triumphed when England's colors were furled at Yorktown.

Literature

AN OLD-FASHIONED GENTLEMAN

WHAT might be appropriately called the "Random Edition" of F. Hopkinson Smith is ranged on a convenient shelf not far from the eastern window beside which this sunny morning I sit and write. It is not a complete edition, "Venice of Today," "The Under Dog" and "The Romance of an Old-Fashioned Gentleman" being among our absent brethren. Those dozen odd books have been plucked at random moments from second-hand book stalls and each of them carries suggestive indications of a chequered past. No two look quite alike—they are dark green and light green and horizon blue; and "Gondola Days," a bedraggled prodigal volume that years ago ran away from home in the Beacon Edition, is washed-out cerise on the covers and brownish pink on the back. "Felix O'Day" is the nearest in appearance to an aristocrat and "The Tides of Barnegat" the closest approach to a gentleman vagabond, for it has literally passed through fire and water and sifts out a tiny rill of stale ashes every time it is opened. Most of them bear the orthodox Scribner imprint, though the Riverside Press is likewise represented, while the latest accession, picked up last summer in British Columbia, bears the name of a Toronto publishing house. When, in addition to all this, I tell you that these Smith books have been read in college libraries and between halves at football games, in accommodation trains and on ferry-boats, by the seashore and in bed and at substantially all hours of the day and night in fair weather and in foul, you will see the propriety of calling them the Random Edition. But when the set is complete—an event which may happen any time within the next twenty years—I purpose to change the name and call it the Old-Fashioned Edition of the most dearly loved old-fashioned gentleman, artist, engineer and writer that America is privileged to claim as her very own.

For to me the late F. Hopkinson Smith, whom I knew and know only through his books and through reproductions of his water colors and charcoal sketches, appeals as a delightfully alert and kindly captivating gentleman of the old school, his Southern graciousness pointed ever so little by Yankee briskness, a perpetual smile gleaming beneath his heavy white moustaches and flocks of tiny thought-and-laughter wrinkles dancing incessantly about his keen and sympathetic eyes. In his professional capacity, I understand, he built the Block Island breakwater and the seawall that encircles Governor's Island; but it seems more significant to remember him as the engineer of the Race Rock Lighthouse in New London harbor, for there he laid the scene of his novel, "Caleb West." And though he constructed the foundation for the Statue of Liberty on Bedloe's Island, he laid the foundation for something even more enduring when he told the story of "Colonel Carter of Cartersville" and reared the fragrant fabric of "Kennedy Square."

This beau ideal of the old-fashioned gentleman, who was born in Baltimore in 1838 and died, as it seems, but yesterday or the day before, was truly a lover of human antiques. Stepping sedately out of a time-stained frame hung in the picture gallery of a vanished epoch comes his immortal Colonel George Fairfax Carter, of Carter Hall, Cartersville, Virginia:

He was, perhaps, fifty years of age, tall and slightly built; with iron-gray hair brushed straight back from his forehead, overlapping his collar behind. His moustache drooped over a firm, well-cut mouth, uniting at the ends with a gray goatee. His voice was soft and low, and tempered with a cadence that was delicious. He wore a black broadcloth coat—a double-breasted garment, with similar colored waistcoat and trousers, a turn-down collar, a shirt of many plaits, which was under-starched and over-wrinkled, but was always clean, large cuffs very much frayed, but which he never forgot to trim as he dressed, a narrow

black or white tie, and low shoes with white cotton stockings.

Akin to the Colonel in charm and suavity and old-world courtesy and refreshing impracticality are more than a score of Southern gentlemen who emerge at memory's bidding from between the battered covers of my Random Edition: St. George Wilmot Temple, the well-groomed bachelor who loved his dogs and his good cheer, who was the father confessor to young Harry Rutter and the charming and capricious Miss Kate, who tasted the dregs of penury without losing either his kindness or his pride of birth; Richard Horn, musician, elocutionist and inventor, "the man of all others about Kennedy Square most beloved, and the man of all others least understood;" old Nathan Gill, the flute-player, with his pen-wiper cloak and his immaterial legs and his heart of beaten gold; Major Clayton, the *bon vivant*, who was wont to dilate, wine-glass in hand, "on the vulgarity of drinking *standing up*—the habitual custom of whiskey tipplers—in contrast with the refinement of sipping wines *sitting down*—one being a vice and the other a virtue;" dear old Peter Grayson, the hero, after all, of the novel "of which he is not the hero;" indeed, all the members of the Chesapeake Club, never so intent on their cigars and gossip and mint juleps as not to spring to their feet with a mighty scraping of chairs and to sweep the sidewalk with their broad black hats in courteous greeting when that wholly delightful old maid, Miss Lavinia Clendenning, daintily tripped across Kennedy Square. Hopkinson Smith's old-fashioned gentleman is always bobbing up in these volumes, for even in distant Venice we find him, this time metamorphosed into Ingenio the gondolier, with "the air of a retired buccaneer and the voice of a girl."

Not even the creator of Colonel Carter could write a shelf full of books with only old-fashioned gentlemen in them, but when young men appear in this Random Edition they are almost exclusively the sort of young men whom old-fashioned gentlemen could love and admire—fine, upstanding fellows like Dr. John Cavendish in "The Tides of Barnegat" or inherently clean and potentially noble lads like Harry Rutter and Oliver Horn and Jack Breen. Villains are almost as scarce in these pages as they are in Hearne's bucolic drama, "Shore Acres"; Jack Breen's cousins are unfortunate rather than criminal and young Willits is merely ill-bred—though to be sure, according to the fine Kennedy Square standard, that is the gravest crime of all.

And the ladies! Well, I dare any man who reads these mellow chronicles of departed days to come into the presence of gentle Mrs. Richard Horn without bowing low and reverently kissing that little hand, so thin and white and tender. I challenge him to meet Miss Lavinia Clendenning in the beautiful autumn of her life without wondering what the young blades of an elder day were about when they refrained from emulating Young Lochinvar and carrying off in spite of danger and opposition a girl, as she must have been, so fair, so brilliant, so vivacious and so pure. I defy him, having entered the little sitting room on Old Peter's arm, not to throw himself at the feet of that other sweet and decided spinster, Miss Felicia Grayson, and beg for the privilege of being her champion and her slave. And as for Hopkinson Smith's younger heroines, whether he introduces them treading the sands along the bleak Atlantic coast or relaxing in the magnolia-scented atmosphere of Kennedy Square, whether their careers are lightened by the charm of Sue Clayton or deepened by the idealism of Kate Seymour or heightened by the winsomeness of Ruth MacFarlane or broadened by the self-reliance of Margaret Grant or saddened even by the pathos that invested the story of Caleb West and the "little gal" who in the end came home—one and all they are such as to make us thank God that such lives can be and that He has put into a human hand the sympathy and delicacy and exceeding skill to limn pictures so inspiring.

Our old-fashioned gentleman—and this most consistently—

loves the old ways and the old wines. What dinners we have in my Random Edition! Verily, we are on holy ground when St. George helps us to Virginia ham and when Colonel Carter carves a duck:

Lay 'em here, Chad—right under my nose. Now hand me that pile of plates sizzlin' hot; and give that caarvin'-knife a turn or two across the hearth. Major, dip a bit of celery in the salt and follow it with a mou'ful of claret. It will prepare yo' palate for the kind of food we raise gentlemen on down my way. See that red blood followin' the knife, suh?

And as for the old wines, in these pages they merge into history, poetry, almost religion. We hang breathless over the table while Major Clayton carefully opens that old, old bottle of 1817 Madeira. And again, when St. George Wilmot Temple, after all his tribulations and reverses, finds himself again in the home of his ancestors and his love and receives from Mr. Kennedy, the novelist, "that last bottle of old Madeira, the Black Warrior of 1810":

Picking up the quaint bottle, he passed his hand tenderly over its crusted surface, paused for an instant to examine the cork, and held it closer to the light that he might note its condition. There he stood musing, his mind far away, his fingers caressing its sides. All the aroma of the past; all the splendor of the old regime—all its good-fellowship, hospitality and courtesy—that which his soul loved—lay imprisoned under his hand.

And yet, for all our old-fashioned gentleman's reverence for old wines, his disgust at the spectacle of drunkenness and his denunciation of excess are unequivocal and impressive. Never to be forgotten, for instance, is the scene in "Kennedy Square" where Edgar Allan Poe, deeply under the influence of liquor comes to St. George's dinner.

Poe grasped the back of the chair reserved for him, stood swaying for an instant, passed one hand nervously across his forehead, brushed back a stray lock that had fallen over his eyebrow . . . and with infinite tenderness and infinite dignity and with the solemnity of a condemned man awaiting death—repeated the Lord's Prayer to the end.

Yes, battered, stained, unshapely to the superficial glance are those books of my Random Edition of F. Hopkinson Smith; but to the inward eye of those who know they are truly beautiful things. They are gardens where crocuses bloom, and syringa and honeysuckle and jasmine; where the green of the Virginia creeper frames the white of the rose and the purple of the wistaria and where the bobolink and the nightingale make music for the soul. Rough and grimy though these books may seem to the fastidious touch, they are soft and gladdening in their contact with mind and heart; they bring new sunshine into life and they help us to discern the sunshine that is already there. Old-fashioned books are they, wondrously like unto the old-fashioned staircase in the house of Richard Horn—"a staircase so pure in style and of so distinguished an air that only maidens in gowns and slippers should have tripped down its steps, and only cavaliers in silk stockings and perukes have waited below for their hands." God rest you, old-fashioned gentleman!

BROTHER LEO.

REVIEWS

Gold, Frankincense and Myrrh. By RALPH ADAMS CRAM, Litt.D., LL.D. Boston: Marshall Jones Company. \$1.25.

Mr. Cram has put Christian people under another debt of gratitude by the publication in permanent form of the three essays contained in this neat, well-printed volume. The three papers in question are "Monasticism and the World Crisis," "Sacramentalism and the Future," and "The Philosophical Necessity." As in all his volumes, so in this, the author pursues his theme with the clear, relentless logic so characteristic of men who have many convictions and the courage thereof.

The world is in need of salvation; and its savior is Catholicism with its Sacraments, and mysticism, illustrated by its va-

rious Religious Orders, and the hundred and one means of grace at hand for the weary, and oftentimes discouraged wayfarer, whether he be an individual or a nation; such the author's story. And nothing less than real Catholicism will do. Protestantism and free thought, industrial civilization, material efficiency, evolutionary philosophy, pragmatism all crumble before the Frankenstein monster they themselves have created. Not so Catholicism, which would solve the riddle, provided only people would accept it in all its entirety and not play at it. But, alas, Americans are not in the mood for this, for

neither St. Athanasius nor St. Dominic nor St. Ignatius Loyola ever confronted bolder and more insidious unfaith and disloyalty. Just because more and more Presbyterians build Gothic churches, with stained-glass windows and twenty-thousand-dollar organs, and an increasing number of our clergy wear Eucharistic vestments and put two candles (frequently unlighted) on their altars, we think that all is well.

Mr. Cram is not content with mere statement: he illustrates his contentions by pointing to the great crisis through which the world has lately passed—if, indeed, it has passed through it—and showing that all mere philosophers were either impotent before it or became apostles of dishonor. And this gave him another chance to insist that the solution of such tremendous difficulties lies in "Sacramentalism as the basic philosophical system of the Church; the Seven Sacraments as its fundamental mode of operation; Holy Mass as the central fact of its worship and its Divine strength, and the reality and efficacy of the Eucharistic Sacrifice."

The book is more than a volume of well-reasoned and clearly expressed thoughts; it is also a manifestation of great enthusiasm for Catholicism. True, there are here and there expressions and ideas to which trained philosophers and theologians will take exception. For few of us will accept Mr. Cram's evaluation of Bergson. While admitting the latter's felicity of style and even admiring the pictorial and dramatic elements of his philosophy, we remember that his teleology is not teleology but only blind fate, while his notion of God, who is but a "continuity of shooting out," and of the human soul will cause us to regret that Mr. Cram places him by the side of the Angelic Doctor. And still another shadow will fall across our faces, as we put the book down, for though Mr. Cram defends Catholicism in a most enthusiastic way, he is not a Catholic. To many of his readers this will be a stumbling block, for cannot they say: If Catholicism is worthy of such praise why does Mr. Cram remain in a Church not in communion with Rome, and if he does willingly remain in such a Church, why does he praise Catholicism? Who can answer such a question satisfactorily? G. F.

A Private in the Guards. By STEPHEN GRAHAM. New York: The Macmillan Co., \$2.50.

During the last eighteen months of the war this gifted writer served as "A Private in the Guards," the "crack" British regiment whose privilege it is to protect the King's person. The plain facts he tells about the brutalizing effects of army-life on the man in the ranks have made the book one of the most widely discussed that the war has produced. His description of the "Little Sparta Barracks" is a ruthless indictment of the English military system and shows that Prussianism is not confined to Germany. "The humiliation of recruits by words or blows, the use of glaringly indecent language, the possibility of squaring punishments" by bribing the non-commissioned officers, and the teaching of fierce hatred for the enemy, are some of the "defects" Mr. Graham sees in the system. He writes:

That the driving-power of the army arose from courage and voluntary sacrifice was the first illusion to fall. The second was that of chivalry. It seems that in former wars one granted to the enemy a great deal of human dignity. Though he was a foe, he was a fellow-creature, and was saved by his Redeemer as much as we were. But the opin-

ion cultivated in the army regarding the Germans was that of a sort of vermin like plague-rats that had to be exterminated. . . . A good soldier was one who would not take a prisoner. If called on to escort prisoners to the cage, it could always be justifiable to kill them on the way and say they tried to escape. Did not So-and-so get a D. S. M. for shooting prisoners? . . . "The second bayonet man kills the wounded," says the bombing instructor. . . . The stories of our brutality inevitably got across to the Germans, and made it worse for our poor fellows on the other side.

The picture the author paints of the ignorance and immorality of the average private who is drawn, as a rule, from the working classes, is very depressing. The Protestant chaplains, largely because they are also officers, have little influence over the men. "Self-respect," which means "keep your buttons bright," *esprit de corps* and obedience are the three virtues the soldier is taught, but meanwhile the barracks' filthy moral tone drags down every decent man who enters the army. In Mr. Graham's opinion a reformation of England's traditional military training is imperative.

W. D.

McAroni Ballads and Other Verses. By T. A. DALY. Frontispiece by HERBERT PULLINGER. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Howe. \$1.50.

The genial author of "Canzoni" and "Madrigali" here introduces his readers to new Italian-American friends like "Joe Gessapalena," who writes with his hoe all over the land "Soocha message. . . . Even dose dat mak' laws mebbe might ondrastan," or Signor del Vecchio who makes such celestial "Ravioli," or G. Scalabrarta, the canny financier, or Moralli, "da wheestlin' barber," whose unbounded joy over his new-born triplets made him whistle the "Sextette from Lucia," or of "Leetla Giuseppina," who "justa com' here from Messina," who is "justa seven, but so smart as she can be," and who recognized an old friend in an ant she met:

"O!" she cried to heem, "Formica"
(Dat's Italian name for heem),
How you gotta here so queeka?
For I know you no can sweem;
An' you was not on da sheepa,
For I did not see you dere.
How you evva mak' da treepa?
Only birds can fly een air.
How you got here from Messina?
O! at last I ondrastand!
You have dugga through da land
Jus' to find your leetla frand, Giuseppina!"

There are a few poems, besides, in the Irish dialect, the best of which is the one describing how Nora O'Hare applied the sermon:

That's the way he wint at them, an' faith, it was splendid—
But wasted, I fear,
Wid the most o' the women for whom 'twas intended,
Not there for to hear.
An' thinks I to meself, walkin' home, what a pity
That Mary Ann Hayes
An' Cordelia McCann should be out o' the city
This day of all days.

"McAroni Ballads" also contains a number of musical poems in the President's English. "Flag o' My Land" has a fine lilting swing, "To a Bereaved Mother" is full of comfort, and in "The Constant Poet" Mr. Daly lets the readers into a little secret, for when he writes for his "Colum" St. Valentine's Day verses to Dolly, Grace, Miranda, Phyllis, and the rest, the truth is, all those "names are merely pseudonyms for 'Mary,' and she's my wife."

W. D.

BOOKS AND AUTHORS

The St. Louis *Herold des Glaubens* recently entered upon its seventieth year. In commemorating this event the editor refers back to its Jesuit founder, Father Seisl, who in 1850 established the paper to combat the attacks made upon faith and religion by the men of Forty-eight. During all these years it has remained

true to the spirit of its worthy founder. Few papers have so perfectly answered the purpose of an interesting, edifying and instructive weekly for the Catholic family circle. It promises for years to come to bring cheer and strength to those who in the dark and trying days, doubly so for its readers, have equally proved their Catholicism and their patriotism.—With its December 8 issue the London *Universe* celebrated its sixtieth birthday. The editor publishes a sketch of that very readable weekly's career, and the letters of congratulation he received from the English bishops. The *Universe* was started at the request of Cardinal Wiseman to answer the calumnies that were made against the Church sixty years ago, and ever since that time the paper has nobly championed every Catholic cause.

In "The Abolishing of Death" (Cosmopolitan Book Corporation, \$1.25) Basil King has put in book-form his articles that appeared recently in the *Cosmopolitan*. The fallacies so patent to the impartial critic of Spiritism are dotting every page of his book. His general thesis may be summed up in saying that we have caused sickness, sorrow and death in the world in which we live. It is not God's doing. We can remedy it as Christ did. And of course the Eternal Son of God in the hands of this writer is merely the superman. What He did we can do, for in proportion to our effort to live up to the conception of the "highest form of life on this planet the Christ in us is liberated, is risen from the dead, and death ceases to have dominion over us." In less than 200 pages Basil King proves to his own satisfaction that nearly every human instinct has been wrong, and only in these latter days has truth begun to flash into the enlightened minds that have found the gospel of Spiritism. We can all get the "new revelation," however, if we take up pen or pencil and let the spirits talk. Thus we shall all be in line for the new heaven or the mad-house, with the odds much in favor of the latter.—In "Séances with Carlyle" (Four Seas Co., \$1.25) we find a clever imitation of the style of that unique genius. There is a touch of humor in the setting. The Ghost of Carlyle dictates his views on the world-upheaval, the Anglo-French relations, poison gas and pragmatism. The book is an imitation of spirit-writing, and the author, Euphemia Macleod, without even hinting at an argument, gives a good refutation of some of the claims of modern Spiritism.

"Best Ghost Stories" (Boni & Liveright, \$0.85) contains such well-known "hair-raisers" as Defoe's "The Apparition of Mrs. Veal"; Kipling's "The Phantom Rickshaw"; Lytton's "The House and the Brain," etc. It is a book of some significance, as an addition to the deluge of Spiritistic literature that has been flooding us these latter days. Arthur B. Reeve introduces the volume with a few pages on "The Fascination of the Ghost Story," which it would take a long treatise to straighten out, his errors are so numerous.—"Red and Black" (Doubleday, Page, \$1.50), Grace S. Richmond's latest novel, has for a hero a fighting parson whose "red-bloodedness" compels the admiration of a skeptical physician. The scene shifts from this country to France, where the minister wins a medal and a bride.—Alice Duer Miller's "The Charm School" (Harper, \$1.40) is a witty and amusing account of the complications that arise when a handsome young bachelor undertakes to manage a young ladies' fashionable academy which he inherits from his aunt. The new headmaster begins to conduct the school on novel lines, discouraging the girls' ambition for higher education and insisting that all they need to learn is "charm" so they can make successful marriages after graduating. As all the pupils and the Italian princess in particular, fall in love with the headmaster, he has his problems.—"Little Miss Muffit" (Moffat, Yard, \$1.60), by Elizabeth Kirby, is the story of a parson's daughter who grew tired of her father's rectory and her provincial surroundings and was consumed by a desire to see life.

Influenced by romantic literature, she determined to break with the old standards and embark on the world of experience. Speculatively she was committed to theories like free love. Her experiments in quest of the great adventure proved disappointing, and she failed to become anything more than unconventional. In the end she makes an old-fashioned marriage. The sub-title, "A love story for grown-ups," is apparently meant as a warning that there are some pages unfit for youthful readers.

EDUCATION

School Legislation, Proposed and Debated

DURING the session of 1918-1919 about 700 laws dealing with education were proposed in the State legislatures, and something like a dozen in Congress. This fact is an indication of the general interest in education, an indication which would be hopeful and encouraging were it not that much of the interest sets in the wrong direction. Nearly all these measures were either rankly Socialistic, or were founded on a political theory foreign to American life and institutions; and practically all that I have examined tend to weaken a most important element in primary education, the interest and control of the home. They range, in the States, from plans to force all children without exception to attend the public schools, to schemes for furnishing all children with free baths, free books, free food, free medical and dental service, free transportation, and free clothing. In Congress, the chief educational bill was, and is, the Smith-Towner, an instrument which establishes a politico-educational autocracy at Washington, and, in the words of Dean Burris, stimulates on a national scale, a condition of political turmoil from which the States and municipalities have been struggling for the last fifty years to extricate themselves.

PROGRESS OF THE SMITH-TOWNER

THIS bill has not been reported, and in face of the growing opposition during the present Congress, probably will not get beyond the Committee on Labor and Education. "The so-called Smith bill," a member of the Committee writes me,

is still in committee, and no action has as yet been taken. It seems to be understood that the bill will not be reported from the committee during the present session. The committee seem to be of opinion that this bill will not pass, and they are giving their entire attention and support to the Kenyon "Americanization" bill [S. 3315]. This bill has been reported, and is on the calendar.

Before presenting an analysis of the "Americanization" bill, it will be interesting to note the light in which it is regarded by the friends of the Smith-Towner fiasco. Under date of November 5, 1919, a prominent member of the Senate of the United States writes:

I have had a talk with Senator ——— about his various bills and the procedure he intends to follow is something like this. He wants to press the "Americanization" scheme [S. 3315] at the earliest possible moment, as an acceptable substitute for the Smith-Bankhead bill. As soon as the Railroad bill is settled, he can get it up for consideration, and is confident that he can secure its passage through the Senate early in the winter.

He is discouraged about the Smith-Towner bill. He says that a certain line of opposition to it is very scattered, and he attaches very little importance to it. My own experience is that he is too optimistic about this opposition. It is scattered, as he says, nevertheless it is effective.

At any rate, his whole conclusion is this: the country is not yet ready for an appropriation on so large a scale as the Smith-Towner bill demands. He hopes that the "Americanization" bill will serve as a kind of stop-gap, and that after three years of operation public sentiment may be built up in support of a measure like the Smith-Towner bill.

Whatever its faults or merits, it would seem that in the minds of some of our legislators, the Kenyon "Americanization" bill is useful only to the extent that it reconciles the country to the Smith-Towner enormity.

THE "AMERICANIZATION" BILL

THE report of the Committee submitted with S. 3315 synthesizes the purposes of the "Americanization" bill. "It considers a program of Americanizing illiterates, and those unable to speak, read or write the English language." The theory of the bill, the report continues, is that the States can be "stimulated" (ominous word!) to compel their illiterates, foreign and domestic, and "citizens of the United States, sixteen years of age or over and under twenty-one, and all residents of more than six months, who are aliens, sixteen years of age or over, and under forty-five," to read, write and speak the English language. "Stimulation" is applied in the familiar form of an appropriation of five million dollars for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and annually thereafter until the end of the fiscal year June 30, 1923, of twelve million five hundred thousand dollars. The bill thus has a life of but three years. The terms upon which the States are to be "stimulated" are very similar to the provisions of the Smith bill. The State must (a) accept the Act, (b) designate an official as custodian of said money, (c) authorize another official to co-operate with the Federal Government in the work authorized, (d) appropriate an amount equal to that allotted by the United States, (e) require, under penalty, the age-classes heretofore mentioned to attend classes for not less than 200 hours per annum, "until they shall have completed a specified course approved by the Secretary of the Interior," and (f) provide, as far as may be possible, for the education of American illiterates, twenty-one years and over, and of resident aliens over forty-five.

The motive and controlling power of the whole Act is the Federal Secretary of the Interior, to whom all courses, plans, teacher-qualifications, and methods used in the preparation of teachers must be submitted for approval. The Secretary also raises and lowers the sluice in the golden stream of the appropriation, in accordance with the judgment by which he separates the States into opposite herds of sheep and goats. Nor is any provision made for appeal from his decision. Further, Section 5, paragraph (h) gives this political officer full power to decide what is and what is not a process calculated to promote "Americanization." It should also be noted that this measure to promote an understanding and practice of true American principles, empowers the Secretary to establish that most un-American of institutions, an "official press."

OHIO AND NEBRASKA DECISIONS

IN Ohio an important decision from which, however, appeal will probably be taken, has been handed down by the Cuyahoga County Court of Appeals on December 13, 1919. On April 1, 1919, the General Assembly of the State of Ohio passed an Act which established English as the basic language of instruction, and forbade the teaching of German in the elementary schools below the eighth grade. Violation of the Act is a misdemeanor punishable by fine, and "each separate day on which such Act shall be violated" constitutes a separate offense. In a test case, Mr. Emil Pohl, a teacher in the Evangelical Lutheran School of Cleveland, Ohio, was convicted. He thereupon appealed, basing his defense on the Bill of Rights of the State of Ohio, and the Fourteenth Amendment. In rendering decision, Judge C. G. Washburn, with concurrence of the full bench, discussed the right of a State to enact legislation deemed necessary for its own protection. The Court found that the Legislature had not abused its discretionary power.

The right to teach the German language is not claimed to be guaranteed in the Constitution, except as it is embraced in the liberty guaranteed in the Bill of Rights, and that liberty is subject to the police power of the State, and the exercise of the police power rests within legislative discretion to determine when the public welfare requires its exercise.

A similar school law was sustained, in part, by the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska on December 26, 1919. The first

section of a law commonly known as the "Siman Law" enacts that "no person, individually or as a teacher, shall in any private, denominational, parochial or public school, teach any subject to any person in any other language than the English language." Violation of this law is a misdemeanor, carrying with it a penalty of thirty days for each offense, with the alternative of a fine. In a test case involving the Nebraska District of Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Missouri, *et al.*, the law was held constitutional by the District Court of Douglas County. Thereupon one John Siedlik, member of the Polish parish of St. Francis, in South Omaha, claiming his right to have his children taught the Polish language in the parish school, took an appeal to the Supreme Court. He based this claim on four sections of the State Constitution, regarding in turn man's inalienable rights, the provision against the deprivation of life, liberty and property without due process of law, the right of every man to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of conscience, and finally, the duty of the legislature to encourage schools and the means of instruction. Further, he invoked the Fourteenth Amendment of the Federal Constitution. With unusual vision, the Court declined to isolate the Siman law, but held that it must be construed with the other statutes passed by the same Legislature. "It is clear," said the Court, "that the purpose of the Legislature was to abolish the teaching of foreign languages in elementary schools . . . as the medium of instruction," not to prohibit such teaching absolutely. "The intent evidently is that none of the time ordinarily employed in teaching the elementary branches . . . shall be consumed in teaching the child a foreign language," and in this provision the law is affirmed. Yet

there is nothing in the Act to prevent parents, teachers or pastors from conveying religious or moral instruction in the language of the parents, or in any other language, or in teaching any other branch of learning or accomplishment, provided that such instruction is given at such time that it will not interfere with the required studies.

"The law was sustained by the Supreme Court," counsel in the case writes me, "but so construed as practically to destroy its effects."

A NEBRASKA CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

AS for new action looking toward the abolition of all authority in education save that of the State, Nebraska and Michigan afford the most radical type. In December, 1919, Mr. Wilbur F. Bryant proposed an amendment to the Constitution of Nebraska which will destroy private elementary schools of every kind. This amendment reads:

The legislature shall provide for the free instruction and universal compulsory education in the common schools of the State of all children from five years upward until each child has completed the eighth grade, or failed because of mental deficiency. Compulsory attendance upon the common schools shall not extend beyond the age of eighteen years.

This is sufficiently drastic, but Mr. Bryant goes beyond this, and proposes the following amendment to the Bill of Rights:

The right of parents to instruct and train their children in the doctrine, the discipline and the rites of any religion, not immoral, until such child reaches the age of discretion, shall not be questioned. But the right of the State to control and to direct the purely secular education of children within its jurisdiction is hereby declared to be absolute, universal, indivisible and inviolate.

This declaration has the great merit of frankness, and fairly represents the philosophy of the average non-Catholic today. Probably he has not thought very deeply on the subject, but firmly set in his mental background is the idea that all right over education belongs to the State, and that parents and private associations which undertake this work do so only by favor and free grant of the State. In a speech delivered some months ago in Philadelphia, the Federal Commissioner of Education is reported

to have said: "Well, we know that after all the child belongs to the State." Thousands who have never phrased the sentiment accept it in practice, take it for granted, and are greatly surprised when it is questioned. This mental attitude, so directly opposed to the traditional Catholic view, and, it should be strongly emphasized, to the traditional American view, prejudices our case at the outset. Men who believe that the child belongs to the State, and men who believe that the child belongs to its parents, can find a common ground for the readjustment of differences with difficulty, if at all.

THE MICHIGAN AMENDMENT

IN Michigan, the proposed Amendment to the State Constitution is in principle identical with the Amendment moved in Nebraska.

Section 16. All residents of the State of Michigan between the age of five years and sixteen years shall attend the public school in their respective districts until they have graduated from the eighth grade; provided, that in districts where the grades do not reach the eighth, all persons herein described in such districts shall complete the course taught therein.

Section 17. The legislature shall enact all necessary legislation to render Section 16 effective.

As in Nebraska, the substance of this Amendment was proposed last year to the legislature of Michigan, and defeated. The persistence with which these measures are advocated year after year suggests the existence of a national propaganda against the parish schools. Since, however, there is a large American population in Nebraska and Michigan, and aggressive societies to place the issue squarely before the American elements in the community, it does not seem likely that these attempts to destroy the just prerogatives of individuals and of the family will succeed.

Nevertheless, the fight for the rights of fathers and mothers to regulate their own affairs without reference to the dictation of some political officer is only beginning. How many Catholics know that the destruction of parental rights in education is the dearest wish of many powerful organizations in this country? And if Catholics refuse to recognize the danger, either because they are simply lazy or fear that by defending Catholic ideals in education they may meet opposition, and then take refuge in the absurd supposition that the rights of the citizen in education and religion are "guaranteed" by the Constitution of the United States, the battle is hopelessly lost.

PAUL L. BLAKELY, S.J.

SOCIOLOGY

One Phase of Americanization

TODAY we are compelled to face squarely the problem of Americanizing the American people, and this, so far as possible, in all its phases. Propaganda must be met with propaganda. We hear from many sides that a German propaganda is being continued in this country, looking, doubtless, in the direction of commercial advantage. It is stoutly maintained by many others that there never has ceased to be a royalist and pro-English element in this country whose loyalty to things English has always been tangible in a strong English propaganda. And now, whether we will or no, we must confess that a Russian propaganda, whose promoters combine the talents of Mephistopheles with the zoological instincts of lewd men of the baser sort, is rampant among us. Every fair means, therefore, to Americanize rather than Russianize or Anglicize the American people should be resorted to.

In the pursuit of a solution a good beginning may prove half the victory. But what sort of a beginning have we hitherto made in the process of attempting the Americanization of the people who have come to adopt our country as their own? Our initial effort, with all its psychological power of suggestion, has diverted their minds from this new land of hope, back across the sea; for

we have told them the first important thing to do is to learn "English."

The way to Americanize our people is, first of all, to teach them our language, the American language.

THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE

ONE may justly ask, what is the English language? When one gets hold of a bit of the English that was spoken, written and read 800 years ago, he would fain have a Chinaman at hand to make known the interpretation thereof, for that English is certainly Chinese to him, if not to the Chinaman.

The somewhat later English of Magna Charta days, even, has much less in common with the American language of Americans than have the dialects of our aborigines, for we have made much of the latter our own while we have gotten almost entirely away from the English of King John. Yet, in the strict sense of the term, English was more English in the days of King John than it ever was before or has been since; and, truthfully speaking, the English of that day is a dead language. Another language has taken its place through a process which has removed the identifying marks of English as it then was, and has built up by assimilation a new tongue out of languages which were distinctly not English. Dr. Albert S. Cook has said: "In all copious dictionaries of the English language, the words of other than purely English origin constitute three-fourths of the whole vocabulary." He states further: "Those which belong to literature, science and art, which express abstract ideas, and the subtle variations of thought, are, in the main, of foreign and chiefly Romanic origin."

THE AMERICAN LANGUAGE

WHAT we need to realize is that we have an American language which is as American as the English language is English.

If the English have borrowed more than three-fourths of what they call the English language, we may as justly consider ourselves indebted to the sources from which it was borrowed as to the medium which passed it on to us; and being so largely made up of the very people from whom so much was originally borrowed, we may claim that we have simply come into our own again; that the English are paying back their lingual debt to the various nations which are reconstituted in us. What is of purely English origin is simply England's contribution to the composite whole. In borrowing this much from the English direct, we find also the opportunity to recompense them by enabling them to understand us when they come to visit us, affording a medium of familiar terms through which we may teach them also the American language.

In the growth of language, new words are often formed by combination, and these new words change by use in order to secure economy of utterance, as well as by analogy, to promote economy of thought. Many Americanisms have grown up in this way. Many others are inventions the utility of which has come to be recognized. Numerous words which have originated in the playing of cards, the clash of parties, political campaigns, the pursuits of commerce, and in the researches of science in its various branches, are essentially American in their origin and have been taken in and made part and parcel of our American language.

It is especially noteworthy that a very fair percentage of our language is derived directly from the dialects of our Indian tribes. This is so even as regards scientific terms. For example, the Algonkian period which in the sphere of geology forms part of the archaic era, was so named because the Algonkin Indians originally inhabited that part of the continent where these primeval deposits were found. Similarly, the great sequoia trees of California were so named by Dr. Endlicher in honor of Sequoyah, the Cherokee Indian who invented letters for his people. The American continent opened up so large and new a field for scientific research that it is not at all strange that many

terms of Indian origin have crept into the scientific portion of the American language. For these and many other terms which the English language has been able to borrow from the American language, the isles of the sea should be truly grateful.

But, to be a little more specific, one would at once think of tobacco in connection with the American Indian. The whole world is now trying to smoke the pipe of peace and to forget about tomahawks and submarines. However, as one opens "Webster's International Dictionary" at the word "tomahawk," two pages present their surface, and on them may be found eleven words which are of Indian origin. Tomahawk is from the Indian "tomahagen." We have made it into both a noun and a verb. Toltec was an Indian tribe. Tobacco is from the Indian "tabaco," and we have made three words out of it. Toboggan is from the Indian "odabagon," and has given us four words. Togue is the same as namaycush (a North American trout) and both are Indian words. As the dictionary in question contains 1,681 pages, not counting the supplementary portions, it is evident that if there are an average of eleven words derived from Indian on every two pages, we have in the American language about 9,240 words which are aboriginal derivatives, while the places with Indian names from the Atlantic to the Pacific, found in gazetteers and railway timetables would greatly extend the number suggested above.

AMERICA FOR AMERICANS!

IT is quite true that more than three-fourths of our American language is not of aboriginal derivation. It may be true that if we added "Americanisms" and all the terms which have originated among the American people in their pursuit of scientific knowledge, commercial intercourse and social pastime, there would still be more than three-fourths of the American language which is not American in its origin; but we must remember that that is precisely what is true of the English language, also, as regards words of English origin.

Enough has been said to show that we Americans have an American language as distinctively American in origin as the English people have an English language distinctively English in origin. The distinctiveness of each is clear. The differentiation exists. The term "American language" is justified.

The American language for the American people! This must be part of any solid solution of the problem of Americanization among our foreign-born population. And if those papers in this country published in foreign languages will parallel every column of foreign language with a column of the same matter in our American tongue, they will greatly facilitate this work of Americanization, in which we justly conceive that they should be as interested as the rest of us. But if each foreign-born element in our national constituency cultivates an alien language at the expense of our national language and unity, it would be unfair to deny to the English a similar right, and then, what becomes of Americanization? Pentecost will be the only remedy for babel and confusion.

J. A. M. RICHEY

NOTE AND COMMENT

Why Must Mothers Work?

THE American Woolen Company will establish a "motherhood insurance," which is to afford four weeks' benefits without cost to every prospective mother in the employ of the corporation. This may be well-meant and highly philanthropic, but we heartily agree with a trade-unionist's comment when he writes: "This announcement may bring joy to 'uplifters' and social workers, but it is a bitter indictment against wages paid to the father and supposed bread-winner." It is indifferent what the wage-rates may be in this particular corporation, but it is time that Ameri-

cans realize that Christian civilization requires the presence of the mother in the household and not in the factory. Once a living wage has been secured for every head of a family it will be possible to legislate against the employment of mothers away from the children whom the Almighty has committed to their own direct care and not to the step-motherly affections of even the best of day-nurseries. Why indeed must mothers work in factories?

Our Missions Among the Colored People

IN making his appeal for the missionaries working among our colored people at home Mgr. John E. Burke offers some interesting statistics. It seems that over sixty new missions were established for the colored people during the last eleven years, and over 60,000 children were added to the Catholic school rolls. "But there are 1,000,000 colored little ones who go to no school. Over 5,000,000 of the 11,000,000 negroes in the United States were never baptized. "It makes one's heart bleed to read the appeals of the missionaries in the Black Belt and to realize how helpless we are to send them more than a mere pittance." The humble salaries of 149 Sisters teaching the colored children must be supplied and a monthly payment of fifteen dollars for living expenses is made to fourteen priests. "A small sum indeed, but they ask for no more." Mgr. Burke, in the last announcement received from him, was still seeking to round out the Ruby Fund of \$40,000 to commemorate the fortieth anniversary of his ordination and to be handed over by him in its entirety to the missions. His incessant labors for the colored people have now extended over thirty-six years. Donations intended for this fund will reach him at the Catholic Board for Mission Work among the Colored People, 1 Madison Avenue, New York.

Catholics, Too, Desire Union

PROPOS of a remark made by the Anglican Bishop of Bombay that "Practically all Indian Christians desire union, except the Roman Catholics," the *Catholic Herald* well observes:

It is absolutely untrue that Catholics do not desire reunion; what is true is that Catholics do not desire that kind of union which appeals to many non-Catholics. And they cannot desire it, because to them it means the opposite of that very unity Christ prayed for. Christ prayed that His might be one as He and His Father are one and that they might be sanctified in truth. Catholics take that to mean that all the disciples of Christ should be one not only in charity but also in faith, that is holding every atom of doctrine, every truth, whether you call it big or small, revealed by Christ.

Now it is part and parcel of the Catholic's faith that his Church is the only true one, that she teaches and has ever taught what Christ has revealed and all that Christ has revealed to be transmitted to mankind. As long as he holds that he is a Catholic, as soon as he deliberately doubts it, he ceases to be one. With such principles how can a Catholic entertain the idea of a scheme of reunion of all Christians, which would imply that heretofore no Church has been completely in the right or in the wrong?

Such an attitude may appear uncompromising: it is, because we scout the idea of compromise where we believe that a Divinely revealed truth is at stake. Not because we fail to understand the necessity of unity, do we stand aloof from so-called attempts at reunion, but because we believe in the necessity of true unity, i. e., faith in all that Christ taught and ordained. Our position is absolutely logical; we want unity in truth, and our faith tells us that the Catholic Church, and she alone, possesses and has always possessed that truth. However sincere and earnest non-Catholic efforts for reunion are, we are bound to believe that as long as they do not lead to the adoption of the whole Catholic creed, they do not lead to union in Christ.

As the Catholic Church, moreover, numbers some 300,000,000 members, more than those of all the other churches combined, she is well able "to stand alone without feeling lonely."